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ABSTRACT

AHMAD HEYDARI

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF DR. GEOFFREY W. GRANT

This research study has four goals: 1) to assess the presence, or the lack, of social distance between American and international students at South Dakota State University (S.D.S.U.); 2) to determine which factors most influence American students' social distance from international students; 3) to determine if church attendance is related to American students' social distance from international students; 4) to assess the strength of social learning and conflict perspectives for understanding and explaining social distance.

The data for this research were collected from American undergraduate students at S.D.S.U. Quantitative statistical procedures were used to analyze the data.

The most important findings are as follows. Social distance exists between American and international students at S.D.S.U. The study shows the chances for social distance decrease as American students' interaction with international students increases. The research indicates that 44.9 percent of American students have
interaction with international students as roommates, neighbors and friends. There was no significant difference between students reporting high or low church attendance with regard to their social distance from international students, but the means show that students with low church attendance have less social distance from international students. Female students have more international friends, and less social distance than do male students. Students with a greater perception of scarce resources, such as competition for grades, exhibit a greater degree of social distance from international students.

It is concluded that both learning and conflict approaches contribute to the understanding of social distance. A synthesis of these perspectives is presented.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

America is a land of fascinating cultural diversity. The Harvard Encyclopedia (Thermstrom, 1980), contains accounts of some 125 American ethnic groups, and the list is by no means exhaustive. The Encyclopedia of American Religions (Melton, 1979), includes information on nearly 1200 groups. Indeed, it is this tremendous range of associational groups that sets America apart from many other cultures.

Nearly 339,000 foreign students of different racial, religious and cultural backgrounds were enrolled in institutions of higher education in the United States and its territories during the academic year 1983-84. This represents a small gain over the 337,000 students enrolled in 1982-83 and is the greatest number of students from abroad ever enrolled in this country in a single year (Grant and Snyder, 1984-86:218).

Prior to World War II the international student was a novelty to most American campuses, but international students have been attracted to the United States in ever increasing numbers in recent years. In 1945, the number of international students attending American colleges and universities was 6,954; and by 1952, this number had increased to 31,000 (Cieslack, 1955:9 in Shepard, 1970:1). The annual census of international students conducted by the Institute of International Education counted 311,882 international
students in 1981-83, 8.9 percent greater than in 1980; twice as large as in 1975; and ten times greater than in 1954 (Smock, 1982:27).

Many educators view this increase as a hopeful development which may lead to greater understanding among the nations of the world, because the international students in recent years are a diverse group, coming from nearly every country in the world (Grant and Snyder, 1985-86:218).

International students may be of different races, and may have different values, traditions, religious backgrounds, different codes of attitude, behavior, and guides for conduct than American students. International students may not be fully integrated into American higher education. Much has been written and spoken about prejudice, racism, discrimination and ill-treatment directed at international students in the United States. As Rentz (1987:10) noted, while most international students are satisfied with their academic experience in the United States, many have also said that they dislike American students because they feel that Americans don't know or even care if they exist. For example, in a study published in 1976, 40 percent of the 247 international students surveyed at 38 southern universities felt "... unwelcome, lonely, and isolated," and the situation is not much different in the North (Rentz, 1987:10).

How American students and others treat international students now could have lasting global consequences. According to Lawson Lau, author of The World at Your Doorstep,

One-third to one-half of the world's top positions in politics, business, education and the military will be filled in the next 25 years by foreign students attending colleges
and universities in the United States. Some of the puzzled and bewildered and sometimes unimpressive-looking sojourners in dorms, cafeterias and classrooms may one day assume national responsibilities in their countries (Rentz, 1987:10).

This study will attempt to explain which factors are most closely related to social distance. Our goal is to develop and test a model of intergroup contact. To achieve our goal a study was conducted at South Dakota State University (S.D.S.U.) during the spring of 1987. American undergraduate students at S.D.S.U. were the focus of this study. During this semester, according to the S.D.S.U. admissions office, the university had 6,443 students enrolled including 5,692 undergraduates and 751 graduate students. From the 6,443 total students enrolled, 309 were international students, and were thus excluded from the study.

In this chapter we will first present a statement of the problem and then discuss the importance of the problem. Next, the objectives of the study will be discussed. Finally, the organization of this dissertation will be presented.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

American students' attitudes toward and relationships with international students have drawn the attention of individuals, researchers as well as of institutions. A visible and significant subset of the student body of many U.S. institutions of higher education is its international student population. These students come from a wide variety of cultures and as Skinner and Hendricks (1977:125)
have put it, "Despite the variety of views of international students Americans may have a common feeling that the international student is somehow different, a 'they' and not a 'we'." The international student is different because he or she is from a culture that may have unique values, traditions, languages, codes of behavior and guides for conduct. Rentz, who teaches English in the Department of International Studies at Arizona State University (1987:10) asserts that:

Since a number of foreign students had asked me for advice on how to make friends with Americans, I helped develop a program in the English language and cultural division which seeks to pair foreign and American students for an hour or so a week of friendly conversation. The first time we tried to run 'conversation partners,' we were inundated with requests from foreign students who were willing and wanting - but most had to wait because we couldn't attract enough American students. We finally contacted church groups and community-service organizations so our students could meet face to face and on a regular basis with average Americans.

We wish to focus on American students' attitudes because the evidence given above indicates these are critical for shaping international students' experiences in American higher education. This study will measure the social distance of American students from international students at S.D.S.U. in Brookings. It is hoped that this study will provide us with a clear, balanced account of the negative or positive attitudes toward international students at this institution. The study will measure social distance in terms of how willing American students would be to interact with various international students in certain social situations. The situations describe different degrees of social contact or social distance. Social distance is related to prejudicial attitudes in that the less the social distance
from a given group indicated by an individual, the less the degree of prejudice felt by the individual toward that group.

Prejudice may be viewed as a system of negative conceptions, feelings, and predispositions to action regarding the members of a particular system: the cognitive, the emotional, and the predisposition to act in a given fashion (Van der Zanden, 1966). Accordingly, it is necessary to distinguish between prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behaviors. Prejudice is a state of mind, while discrimination entails overt action in which members of a group are accorded unfavorable treatment on the basis of their religious, ethnic, racial or cultural membership (McLemore, 1980:102).

This study will examine the following questions:
1. Does social distance between American and international students exist at S.D.S.U.?
2. Does church attendance have an effect on the American student's social distance from international students?
3. How do demographic and individual characteristics of age, education, cross-cultural experience, family background, rural or urban origin, and gender effect the American student's degree of social distance from international students?
4. Which theoretical perspective best explains the empirically measured social distance found here at S.D.S.U.?
IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM

American students' social distance from international students is the primary focus of this study. The possibilities of forging friendships with international students are so beneficial that Richard Berendzen, president of American University in Washington, D.C., has advocated increased government support for international education. The "... future leaders of the developing world," he has said, "not only will get a diploma in the United States but also will gain ... some understanding of our culture ranging from our form of government to our sports, from our t.v. to our food, from our business life to our spiritual life." (Berendzen, 1987:10). The situation is no less critical at S.D.S.U. than it is in other campuses of the nation.

The history of the social distance from international students goes back before the time of World War I and the Great Depression of the 1920s and 30s. Hurrey (1925:138) found that many international students encountered discrimination and ill-treatment. Schaefer (1984) and Rentz (1987) found similar ill-treatment and great social distance between American and international students.

The impact of the American student's social distance from international students has importance at both practical and theoretical levels. On the practical level, most American college students are involved with some international students in the classroom, dormitory, or campus life. It is important that we be able to predict how social distance will affect American students' relationships with these vis-
itors. Also on the practical level this study is of importance to the S.D.S.U. community, both foreign and domestic. It may also be of interest to the administration at the school in planning programs and policy. On a larger scale, it may impact international relations as international students return home.

The American social distance from international students has importance on a theoretical level as well. Studies using social distance and prejudice theory have received a substantial amount of support (McLemore 1980:109). The theories of prejudice have usually concerned the social psychology of inter-group attitudes and relations. Both the social learning and conflict perspectives are important areas of theory, and following a brief assessment of their current status these theories will be tested to understand which best explains social distance in this instance.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. In this exploratory study of social distance the researcher will survey a sample of undergraduate American students at S.D.S.U. in an effort to determine the degree of their social distance from various nationalities.

2. The survey data will be used to determine what factors affect American students' social distance from international students.

3. Using the conclusions drawn from the survey data, the researcher will produce an account of the social distance American students feel toward their fellow students from other
countries.

4. Finally, we wish this study to serve as a test of social learning and conflict theories for understanding important aspects of social distance of American students from international students.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS DISSERTATION

The research will be approached as follows in the chapters ahead: Chapter 2 is a review of literature in the areas of social learning, prejudice, cultural norm transmission and social conflict; Chapter 3 is an examination of the theoretical framework upon which this study is based; Chapter 4 is a description of the methodological and data collection procedures; Chapter 5 is the analysis of data; Chapter 6 is a presentation of the findings and conclusions; and Chapter 7 is a discussion of the limitations of this study, its implications and the researcher's recommendations for future investigation.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The literature on American student attitudes toward international students or "study of determinants of social distance" is extensive. However, there are a small number of empirical studies on this subject. The range of definitions for attitudes is as voluminous as the attitude literature. Literature on the related concepts of social learning, social conflict and their factors such as: culture, gender, religion, awareness, prejudice, family, ethnocentrism, norm transmission, ethnicity, social economic status, and scarce resources are extensive and varied. The primary importance for selecting this literature is to see whether there are any significant differences in attitudes, and degrees of social distance toward given areas related to international students.

The review begins with literature related to the history of student exchange. This is followed by an overview of literature related to early research. The next section reviews studies that examine selected attitudes, social learning, social conflict and related concepts and factors. The last section reports literature that deals with social distance.
HISTORY OF STUDENTS' EXCHANGE

International students have been attracted towards American, beginning in 1787 with Francisco de Miranda, one of the "revolutionary trinity" of Venezuela and Colombia (Wheeler, 1924:xv). Miranda studied at Yale, as did Yung Wing, an important Chinese revolutionary who returned to China in 1859. Joseph Hardy Neesima, the founder of Doshisha University, was in the United States in 1865-74 (ibid:XV). These and many other men were pioneers among the students who have come from the South, East and West to America. Today the U.S.A. has the largest enrollment of international students, 339,000, of all countries in the world (Grant & Snyder, 1984:218). There has long been student exchange.

EARLY RESEARCH

Interest in American Student attitudes and the degree of social distance and their acceptance of international students was an early topic of interest. A commission to conduct a survey of American and foreign student attitudes toward each other in the United States of America was organized in March, 1922. A detailed survey was undertaken, the purpose of which was "to ascertain and assemble complete information regarding foreign students in the United States, and to define their needs and problems with a view to formulating an adequate Christian program on their behalf" (Hurrey, 1925). The following information reflects some findings from that survey.
The cultural backgrounds, socialization experiences, political views, and religious beliefs, of the international students who came to American colleges, were extraordinarily diverse. These backgrounds sometimes made it difficult for the American students to understand and accept responsibility for relationships with international students (Wheeler, 1925:xvi). Wheeler indicated that:

There is much evidence as to the loneliness of international students after they have taken up residence in U.S.A. and of the incalculable results which have come from the thoughtfulness and hospitality of Americans who have invited students into their own homes. Some students have been in U.S.A. five to six years without having received the friendly relations with American students or the hospitality of a family circle. Although the majority of international students who have studied in U.S.A. return to their homelands with warm feelings of friendship and affection for this country. (ibid:xx).

Hurrey, YMCA General Secretary, in his research "The Foreign Student and American Life" found that many international students encounter discrimination and ill treatment. More specifically, Hurrey (1925) found color consciousness is not restricted to any one section of the U.S.A. and students of other races are often not received into social circles on the same basis as whites. This stirs deeper and more abiding resentment than any other rebuff the student encounters (Hurrey, 1925: 138). Schaefer (1984) found similar ill treatment and social distance among groups.

The early research on this topic demonstrates a concern for student relationships. Some of these same concerns continue today. The following are some selected factors influencing the individual or group attitudes and the degree of social distance from other
individuals or groups.

SOCIAL LEARNING AND CULTURE

One concern in this research is with the process by which social learning and cultural learning produce certain awareness or knowledge, attitudes, skills and degrees of social distance. The literature on attitudes, ethnocentrism, socio-cultural context of learning, ethnicity and culture, religion, cross cultural awareness, prejudice, and value expectations will be investigated. Finally we will look at cultural norm transmission in the context of this literature. It may be helpful to first analyze the concept attitude.

Ethnocentrism:

Ethnocentrism is another important correlate of negative attitudes and one of the factors of the social learning process. For the most part studies have shown that American students have prejudicial attitudes toward students from other cultures or ethnic groups. The Allport and Kramer (1946) study indicated that students of college trained parents tended to be more tolerant of ethnic group students than students of non-college parents.

Schaefer (1984) found that ill feelings among groups can result from ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism is the tendency to evaluate other cultures in terms of one’s own culture as superior to all others (Bassis, Gelles, and Levine, 1980:77). The anthropologists use the term culture shock to describe the feelings of disorientation and
stress that people experience when they enter an unfamiliar cultural setting. Cultural shock often occurs when we visit a foreign land, even one whose culture is similar to our own (as when an American visits Great Britain or an English person visits the U.S.A.). People can also experience cultural shock within their own country: for example a Jewish American, when moving into an Italian American or Moslem American neighborhood, or of a country boy/girl going to the big city. Typical "symptoms" of culture shock include feelings of incompetence; fear of being contaminated by drink, cheated, or laughed at; and loneliness. Suddenly, familiar behavioral cues are taken away and replaced by new patterns that, at first, make little sense. Ordinary everyday life becomes very difficult to predict.

Ethnocentrism is part of cultural shock. And cultural shock occurs because of enculturation (Bassis, Gelles, and Levine, 1980:77). We learn our own cultural patterns so early in life, and so thoroughly, that they become second nature. We equate our distinctive way of thinking and behaving with 'common sense.' "We conform out of habit, without stopping to consider alternatives. We don't realize how dependent we are on shared understandings about what is appropriate. Confronted with other ways of doing things, we are sometimes merely amused, but sometimes annoyed, repulsed, or shocked" (ibid:77).

Seeman (1981:382) noted that "the ethnocentric syndrome can easily include nonexistent groups, the famously disliked Pireneans, Danireans, and Wallonians (Hartley 1946: Epstein and Komorita,
Ethnocentrism is functional; it serves the group in its struggles for power and wealth and it flourishes best in conflict situations (Winter, 1960-61:201-211). Hrabá (1979:102) believed ethnocentrism ultimately involves the issue of honor. Some theorists feel that honor is as important in ethnic stratification as are inter-group competition and comparative power. Often one group will subordinate another because of its abhorrence for the culture or race of that group, and not merely for its economic advantage (ibid:102). Those in the Marxian tradition oppose this view and consider ethnocentrism merely incidental to the economic determinants of ethnic stratification. They feel that ethnocentrism or racism is nothing more than a ruse for the more fundamental reality of the exploitation of labor by capital (Hrabá, 1979:102). We will investigate the conflict perspective view of ethnocentrism in Chapter 3.

Ethnocentrism can be seen as based on cultural misunderstandings (Sumner, 1959:14). Taken out of context, any custom can seem ridiculous. Cultural and cross-cultural studies stress that people experiences and awareness have important impact, when they enter an unfamiliar or even similar cultural setting. Hence, an investigation of the students' social cultural learning is another factor required of social learning process in this study.

The Social-Cultural Context of Learning:

The American and international students' cultures are
extremely different, and as Bassis, Gelles and Levine, (1980:66) noted, "our very lives depend on culture and cultural setting."

A. Culture

Culture has been described as a "design for living" (Kluckhohn, 1949) and as "a set of control mechanisms - plans, recipes, rules, constructions, what computer engineers call programs for governing behavior" (Geertz, 1973). It is our species' way of adapting to the environment. All cultures are designs for living - courtship rituals, child-rearing patterns, strategies for acquiring food and water and for establishing territories, and so on. What is special about culture is that it is a design for living that is acquired through learning. Through socialization, we acquire the culture of the society in which we are raised; we learn its particular design for living. Human development and relations depends on socialization -- the ongoing process of interaction through which we acquire a personal identity and social skills (ibid:66).

One important characteristic to note about the human learning process in the family, church, school, and in other social institutions, is that cultural learning for any person involves other human beings. The learning process that occurs in social situations is a social phenomenon. Learning cannot be explained as a unique phenomenon, the result of the idiosyncratic characteristics of students alone. It is usually impossible to explain adequately why an individual learns what he or she does by taking into account only the characteristics of that person (Brookover and Erickson, 1975: 260).
B. Physical and Environmental Conditions

One's perceptions, health, age, and physical and emotional state are all very important conditions in the learning process. However, these individual characteristics of students are not the only important conditions affecting learning. Classmates as well as teachers, other school staff, relatives, churches, families and friends are also likely to be active participants in the learning process of each student. This interactive process among students with peers, teachers, and others is every bit as important in understanding what they learn as are the individual characteristics they bring to school, family, and society. To aid in this analysis, some concepts such as religions, ethnicity, cross-cultural awareness, norms, rules and expectations, gender and rural-urban residence, behaviors are important to cultural learning.

Ethnicity, Race and Culture

In this study, we will look at American students' attitudes toward different ethnic groups, rather than at their attitudes toward different races. Some of the difficulty with the term race arises from the fact that people do not make the proper distinction between that which is biological and hereditary, on the one hand, and that which is learned and acquired, on the other. No one denies that we come into the world devoid of political convictions, religious affiliations, recreational interests, and literary tastes. We learn all of these things, and we learn them from those with whom we associate (Tischler, 1978:37).
The term ethnic group (or minority) is learned from other society. According to Schaeffer (1984:8-9) minority groups are designated by their ethnicity and are distinguished from the dominant group on the basis of cultural differences such as language, attitudes and behavior toward the political system, religion, marriage and parenting patterns, food habits, and so forth. Ethnic groups, "therefore, are groups set apart from others because of their national origin or distinctive cultural pattern." (ibid:9).

Milton Gordon wrote that both minority and majority groups are ethnic subsocieties with distinct subcultures in modern American society (Hraba, 1979:346). Minority or ethnic groups attempt to follow the folkway past, whether the groups merge into or pull away from modern society. Ethnicity is the following to some degree, of traditions, the awareness and consciousness of kind among group members, and their sense of historical background, all of which is guided and structured and given organizational expression through newspapers, fraternal societies, churches, schools, and the informal relationship among both males and females.

Ethnicity has provided obstacles to united intergroup relationships when associated with negative attitudes. The emotional "pre-judgment" of members of other minority or ethnic groups is in essence an attitude related to political, cultural, educational, situational, religiosity and personal factors which intrude upon the individual in modern society. Attempts to explain the source of attitudes of antipathy in the intolerant individual has been presented in
theoretical propositions, but clear results have not been reached. There is also considerable dispute about the relative effectiveness of formal religious, and school education programs, contact and acquaintance or awareness programs, group retraining, information through mass media, and strong argument (Allport, 1954). Yet there is still great hope that education, family, church, and the mass-media may promote positive attitudes and less social distance and will attach overgeneralized beliefs and moderate prejudicial attitudes and social distance from ethnic groups.

Religion

Religion and ethnicity continue to play a significant role in defining an individual's identity. There are more than 130 organized religions in the United States ranging from the nearly 50 million members of the Roman Catholic church to sects with less than a thousand members (Schaefer, 1984:140). Even with large-scale immigration almost two generations past, an American today is surrounded by remnants of cultures and practitioners of religions whose origins are foreign to this country. Religion and ethnicity continue to play a significant role in defining an individual's identity (ibid:140).

Sociologists use the word denomination to refer to a large, organized religion not officially linked with the state or government. By far the largest single denomination in the United States is Roman Catholicism, yet at least twenty-three other religious faiths have one million or more members. Protestants collectively accounted for about 59 percent of the nation's adult population in 1981, as compared with
29 percent for Roman Catholics and about 3 percent for Jews, and 9 percent for the number of people who adhere to such Eastern faiths as Islam, Hinduism, Confucianism and Taoism (ibid:141).

Differences in religious belief, however, frequently reflected different status positions; social changes and conflicts were accompanied by religious differentiation. At a time when the religious view of life was extremely powerful, it was easy to believe that a religiously different group was inferior (Simpson and Yinger, 1964:83).

A theory of prejudice beliefs helps to account for the use of religious prejudice in secular group conflicts. The medieval world believed that life on earth was a brief second, that eternal salvation was the most important thing. An examination of the setting in which this religious prejudice flourished, however, shows that a strictly "religious" explanation of the conflict is insufficient (Benedict, 1940:220-223).

Cross-Cultural Awareness

Cultural awareness is another important factor of the social learning process. How students experience the world is in some ways unique and in some ways commonly shared with others. American students cross-cultural awareness is dependent on the level of knowledge or information about international students' cultures as well as other factors such as communications. Communication is essentially a process of structuring reality through perception and symbolization (Myers and Myers, 1980:20-22). How American and
international students do this structuring shapes the information they gain from all the stimulations they get and thus shapes their image of what the world or their culture is like. This is fundamental because their behavior is based on their image and knowledge of what the other culture is like, and on how they experience events, people, roles, cultures, and things (ibid). In Chapter 3 we will view this process of learning as central to understanding group relations.

Although trust is a basic characteristic of much communication and interaction, it is not always to be found - nor is its presence necessary in order for social interaction to occur. "Many situations of everyday life, in fact, are characterized by pretense and suspicion, rather than trust" (Garfinkel, 1963). As Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss have pointed out in their analysis of interaction between dying patients and physicians, hospital staff, and families; "some social contexts are marked by ignorance, suspicion, or pretense in what interactants know of one another's roles. They define an awareness context as . . . the total combination of what each interactant knows about the identity of the other and his own identity in the eyes of the other" (Hewit, 1976:157).

The literature (Hurrey, 1925; Galvin and Book, 1978; Myers, 1980; and Schaefer, 1984) shows the cross-cultural knowledge of American students about the various racial and ethnic international students in different colleges and universities in the U.S.A. varies. Their attitudes and behaviors towards racial and ethnic groups are related among other things to their degree of cross-cultural
awareness and experiences.

**Prejudice**

Prejudice, which is important to social learning and cultural norms, is important to group conflict and social distance studies as well. Prejudice is generally used as a particular attitude, either positive or negative, toward an entire category of people. The two important components in this definition are "attitude" and "entire category" (Schaefer, 1984). Prejudice involves attitudes, thoughts, and beliefs, not actions, but it may be manifest in action. Frequently prejudice is expressed through the use of ethnic slurs which include derisive nicknames.

In all definitions there is a common understanding about what prejudice is and what it is not. Prejudice is not overt behavior; it is always an attitude, an internal state, or a set of beliefs and feelings about some ethnic or racial group (Hraba, 1979:123). "Essentially, the socialization explanation of prejudice asserts that the child learns to differentiate various groups and to attach positive or negative valuations to these groups. Prejudice is acquired much as any other aspect of culture; by the learning of society or group norms" (Westie, 1964:58).

**Norms, Values, Expectations**

Within a society or culture there are norms which define the boundaries of appropriate and permissible behavior and attitudes. Such norms are closely related to the role expectations which persons
hold for individuals behaving in particular social statuses such as student and teacher. Norms are expectations concerning how people should behave which apply to specific or general categories of persons (Brookover and Erickson, 1975:262).

American and international students develop a system of norms which set the scene in which interpersonal relationships may be established and activities carried on. Norms are rules of behavior, the dos and don'ts of interpersonal communication, the "proper" ways of acting which have been accepted as legitimate by members of the group (Myers, 1980:269). Norms may be formalized in a set of written rules and regulations, particularly in large groups, or they can be informally derived through group communication, generally in small groups (ibid).

Values are broad abstract, shared standards of what is right, desirable, and worthy of respect (Bassis, 1984:69). Although values are widely shared, they are seldom adhered to at all times by every member of a culture. Value systems are not limited to views and attitudes on economics and productivity. The person's mode of finding meaning in life and of developing a blueprint for personal conduct is also a value system (Hoose and Worth, 1982:42). Values developed by the individual may vary from values held by society as a whole. A social value, is understood as "any datum having an empirical content accessible to the members of some social group and a meaning with regard to which it is or may be an object of activity" (Thomas and Znaniecki, see The Polish Peasant, 1, 1918-1920, p.)
The authors specified further that only certain classes of values, namely those that are embodied in norms and rules of conduct, come within the purview of sociological investigation. These values consist of the "more or less explicit and formal rules of behavior by which the group tends to maintain, to regulate, and to make more general and more frequent the corresponding types of actions among its members. These rules are ... customs and rituals, legal and educational norms, obligatory beliefs and aims, etc" (ibid:31).

Cultural Norm Transmission

The building blocks of social learning, conformity, conflict, prejudice and social distance are contained within the society's traditions or culture and are transmitted to children in a natural way as they are exposed to those traditions in the home and community.

Two aspects of a culture are particularly closely related to the extent and kind of prejudice that is found in a given society (McLemore, 1980:105). The first of these has to do with the shared beliefs, awareness or knowledge that the members of one group have about the members of the other groups in the society. The second has to do with a culture's prescriptions concerning the degrees of intimacy or "nearness" that one group's members should permit or desire from any other group's members (ibid).

To illustrate the first point, consider the kind of "information" that the children of Anglo-Americans are likely to receive regarding various other ethnic groups in America. Are they not likely to learn by direct instruction, indirect instruction, and
accidentally that the Germans are persistent, the Mexicans are lazy, the Italians are artistic, the Irish are quick-tempered, the Jews are mercenary, the Muslims are friendly, and the French are amorous (ibid)? Even the children of quite "liberal" parents are likely to acquire such ideas as they come in to contact with a wider circle of people in the neighborhood and school. Moreover, the children usually learn that the members of different groups possess not just a single distinctive trait but a cluster of such traits. The extent to which these shared beliefs exist within a society's culture and are transmitted more or less intact from one generation to the next has stimulated a large number of studies of stereotypes. The extent to which a person accepts stereotypes is frequently used to determine how prejudiced he or she is (McLemore, 1980:105).

The term stereotype, like the term prejudice, has been defined in a number of ways. Walter Lippmann has defined stereotypes as "pictures in our heads" (Klineberg, 1974:631). Ehrlich (1973:20) considers them to be "a set of beliefs and disbeliefs about any group of people." And Allport (1958:187) states that "a stereotype is an exaggerated belief associated with a category." For this study, a stereotype is a belief not based upon empirical evidence, concerning the characteristics of the members of a racial or ethnic group. The stereotype assists to generate and to sustain prejudice. Katz and Braly (1933), for example, found that the Princeton College students in their sample agreed that stereotypes about German, English, Negroes, Turks, Jews and other racial or ethnic groups exist
very strongly within American culture. Kelly (1984:77) mentions that because socializing influences and experiences vary a great deal, the students in colleges are frequently confronted with conflicting definitions of a situation. We will focus on conflict in the next section.

REVIEW OF CONFLICT, PREJUDICE AND SOCIAL DISTANCE

In the previous review of literature, attention has been focused upon the factors contributing to American students' attitudes and the relationship of the social learning perspective to these attitudes. In this part we will examine some of the chief processes and patterns of intergroup interaction within student life, and we will examine conflict, prejudice, and social distance.

In contrast to the functionalists' emphasis on stability, conflict sociologists see the social world in continual struggle. The conflict perspective assumes that social attitudes and behavior are best understood in terms of conflict or tension among competing groups. Such conflicts need not be physically violent, and may take other forms.

Students are accustomed to associating interracial and inter-ethnic relations with "social problems." The fact that conflict often represents an important ingredient in such relations probably further this point of view (Vander Zanden 1963:197). Vander Zanden (1966) noted "it is not uncommon for conflict to be equated with violence. While it is true that riots, lynching, and related forms of
violence may periodically emerge when differing racial or ethnic groups are in contact, conflict need not be expressed exclusively in violent terms. Boycotts, strikes, wade-ins, sit-ins, passive resistance, legal litigation, at times even wit and humor, represent forms of conflict in which violence may be absent" (Vander Zanden, 1963:197). Conflict may be thought of as a struggle over values and claims to wealth, power, prestige, scarce resources, competitive struggle for economic, class struggle and competition (Marx, 1930; Park, 1950; Berry, 1951, Simpson and Yinger, 1965; Vander Zanden, 1966; Tischler, 1978; McLemore, 1980; Farley, 1982) in which the opponents aim to neutralize, injure, or eliminate their rivals. In its most extreme expression it may result in the total annihilation of a group. This was the fate of a number of American Indian tribes (Vander Zanden, 1966 and Hraba, 1979).

The conflict model is one we often select today when examining race and ethnicity, because it readily accounts for the presence of tension between competing groups. The competition, according to the conflict perspective, takes place between groups with unequal amounts of economic and political power. Some of the early sociological work on intergroup relations by Robert Park and Ernest W. Burgess (1921) identified competition and conflict as important aspects in the distribution of economic rewards. In the world of capitalism, for example, the nuclear cell of the capitalist system, the factory, is the prime locus of antagonism between classes -- between exploiters and exploited, between buyers and sellers of labor power
rather than of collaboration. Class interests and the confrontations of power that they bring in their wake are to Marx the central determinant of social and historical process (Coser, 1977:46-48).

Marx’s analysis continually centers on how the relationships between men are shaped by their relative positions in regard to the means of production, that is, by their differential access to scarce resources and scarce power. Marx and Engels noted that unequal access need not at all times and under all conditions lead to active class struggle. But Marx considered it axiomatic that the potential for class conflict is inherent in every differentiated society, since such a society systematically generates conflict of interest between persons and groups differentially located within the social structure, and more particularly, in relation to the means of production (see Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The German Ideology, New York, International Publishers, 1930:48-49).

For Karl Marx, the central focus of interest is the attempt by dominant-group workers to realize economic gains by "keeping down" the workers of minority groups. Presumably, if minority group workers were free to rise into cleaner, higher-paying jobs, they would do so (Glenn, 1966:161). Simultaneously, the possibility that minority-group workers will pose a threat of taking jobs away from the dominant-group members is reduced. Marxian writers argue that this strategy on the part of dominant-group workers is mistaken (McLemore, 1980:114). Many writers have argued that high prejudice levels among white workers are quite consistent with their own eco-
onomic interests and serve actually to increase the white workers' economic rewards (see, e.g., Myrdal, 1964:68). This theme has been pursued in an especially telling way in a theory advanced by Bonacich (1972; 1973; 1975; 1976). Bonacich agrees with the Marxian writers that economic forces are at the root of ethnic antagonisms, but she disagrees that the conflict between white and black workers is economically "irrational." She argues that such a theory of prejudice attitudes and behavior are not adequate to explain the actual course of race relations in American history.

Those who follow the conflict approach in the area of race and ethnicity have repeatedly noted that the subordinate group is criticized for its low status, whereas the responsibilities of the dominant group for the subordination are often ignored. William Ryan (1976) calls this an instance of "blaming the victim": portraying the problems of racial and ethnic minorities as their fault rather than recognizing society's responsibility. This idea is not new. Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish social economist with an international reputation, headed up a project that produced the classic 1944 work on blacks in United States, *The American Dilemma*. Myrdal concluded that the plight of the subordinate group is the responsibility of the dominant majority. It is not a black problem, but a white problem. Similarly, it is not an Hispanic problem or a Cuban refugee problem, but a white problem. He and others since then have reminded the public and policy makers alike that the ultimate responsibility for society's problems must rest with those people who wield the most authority
and possess most of economic resources (Myrdal, 1944).

**Ethnicity, Color and Politics**

Skin color and cultural style can become emblematic of intergroup rivalry. Moreover, systems of racial stratification not only serve in the protection of wealth and power, they also help a wealthy and powerful group in the conservation of its honor. In a system of ethnic stratification, subordinate groups are limited not only in their access to wealth and power but also in their access to the symbols of power and privilege. Intergroup conflict and racial stratification involve the issue of honor as much as they do the distribution of wealth and power (Hraba, 1979:106).

Frantz Fanon wrote, in the *Wretched of the Earth* (1963), that racial conflict is not some disguised form of class struggle, and racial violence is necessary for Africans in their revolt against white colonialism. Cox (1948) believed that there is one slight difference between race relations and the history of class struggle. In suggesting correctives of race relations in South, Cox again demonstrated his belief that racial exploitation is essentially the capitalist exploitation of labor by a political class struggle (Cox, 1948:573).

Racial reasons for persecution are convenient in modern life, as Bendict (1940) has pointed out, because of the greatly increased contact among the members of different races and nationalities and because of racial and nationality or ethnicity heterogeneity of many societies. Emerging science, with its efforts to measure color or physical differences and its studies of racial origins, drew
attention to race, and its data were distorted to justify the use of race differences in economic conflict. The racial and ethnicity line of cleavage had the additional advantage, as a weapon, of relative permanence. Poverty and culture, or occupation, or language, or religion or politic or family system or education system or mass-media system can set a group apart as sharply as skin color or head shape, but the line of distinction may be more difficult for the dominant group to maintain (Benedict, 1940:233-236).

SOCIAL DISTANCE

Robert Park and Ernest Burgess first defined social distance as the tendency to approach or withdraw from a racial group (1921:440). A few years later, Emory Bogardus (1925, 1938, 1933, 1968) conceptualized a scale that could empirically measure social distance. So widely used is his social distance scale that it is frequently referred to as the Bogardus scale (Schaefer, 1984:66).

The scale asks people how willing they would be to interact with various racial and ethnic groups in certain social situations. The situations describe different degrees of social contact or social distance.

One outstanding result of investigations of racial prejudice is the uniformity in the pattern of discrimination against various races shown by Americans throughout the United States. People in widely separated parts of the country show a high degree of
agreement in their expressions of relative liking or disliking of different "foreign" groups (Katz and Braly, 1935:175).

In an early study Bogardus asked 110 businessmen and school teachers about the degrees of social intimacy to which they were willing to admit certain ethnic groups. The degrees of social distance employed were: to my family through marriage, to my club as personal chum, to my street as neighbor, to employment in my occupation, to citizenship in my country, to my country as visitor only, and exclusion from my country. By weighting these seven classifications, Bogardus prepared a preferential rating of 23 ethnic groups (ibid).

The Bogardus study was carried out on the Pacific Coast but studies made in other parts of the United States indicate the same pattern of preferences for various groups. In the Middle West, for example, Thurston (1929) constructed a scale on the basis of the likes and dislikes of 239 students. The results were classified by rank order and scale values for 21 ethnic groups (ibid).

In 1926, Bogardus secured the responses of 1,725 Americans to forty racial and ethnic groups. The individuals were from eighteen to thirty-five years of age, of which approximately half were college students and half were college graduates who were employed but were taking one or more post-graduate courses. The study was conducted among respondents from thirty-two well-distributed areas in the United States and included Negroes who constituted ten percent of the participants. Bogardus obtained a racial distance
quotient (RDQ) for each group by adding together the number of points associated with the statement nearest the top of the scale in the various completed questionnaires. The lowest possible RDQ would be 1.00 and the highest, 7.00. The results of the 1926 study and identical studies in 1946 (with 1,950 subjects) and 1956 (with 2,053 subjects) indicated that:

Near the top of the preference-ranking scale are English, native White Americans, and other northern Europeans; then Spaniards, Italians, and generally southern and eastern Europeans; near the bottom, Orientals and Negroes. In looking at the greatest distance score given any group in each of the three years (1926, 1946, and 1956), it is of interest to note that through the years a decline occurred in distance reactions respectively 3.91, 3.61, and 2.83 (Vander Zanden, 1963:73).

Social scientists within the United States have been checking the social-distance positions of various groups by this means for many years. The most striking of their findings is that the pattern of preference is found across the nation, varying little with income, region, education, occupation, or even with ethnic group. With a few minor shifts, the relative positions of the groups remain substantially constant. Thus, a similar social-distance ranking has been found from such diverse parts of the nation as Florida, New York, Illinois, Kansas, Nebraska, and Washington.

The extent of prejudice as illustrated in the ranking of racial and ethnic groups seems to be widely shared (Bogardus, 1959; Yinger, n.d.; Zeligs and Hendrickson, 1933; Hartley, 1946; Derbyshire and Brody, 1964a, 1964b; Prothro and Jensen, 1952; Kinlock and Borders, 1972; Kinlock, 1973; and Owen et al., 1981, see Schaefer,
Donna Hess (1981), in her study of American students at South Dakota State University (S.D.S.U.), found that there were different degrees of social contact or social distance toward different nationality groups. She found that American students desired more social distance from southeast Asians, Arabs, and Iranian students than twenty-nine other groups at S.D.S.U.

A tentative conclusion we can draw from social distance studies is that the extent of prejudice is decreasing. Although the change is slight from survey to survey, it is consistently downward. The spread in social distance (the difference between the top and bottom ranked groups) also declines from 1926 to 1966, indicating that fewer distinctions are being made, although some are still being made. This has been empirically confirmed in research on stereotypes also (Schaefer, 1984:68).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS FROM THE LITERATURE

In sum, the above literature review points out: first, that there are early research views on the prejudice attitudes toward minority groups and international students in the United States. The social learning perspective suggests that prejudicial attitudes are largely or totally learned, while the conflict perspective contends that prejudicial attitudes are useful in maintaining in-group advantages. A second body of literature suggests that lack of enculturation by
international students leads to social distance which, in turn, manifests itself in a number of negative attitudes. This literature also suggests that the general pattern of social distance that is transmitted from generation to generation in the United States is the pattern that was created through the historical sequences of intergroup contact that we already have observed among college and university students.

The purpose of the literature review cited in this research lies in the area of American attitudes toward different ethnic student groups. In the present study conducted at South Dakota State University the researcher will examine American student attitudes toward international students and social distance when variables such as age, gender, family, cultural awareness, religiosity, ethnocentrism, social economic status, race and ethnicity and scarce resources, etc. are taken into account. From the review of the literature already cited, there seems to be some consistency in American attitudes, corresponding to certain characteristics of the American students. For example, females and males are socialized differently in American society. In general, females would like to have more interaction with individuals.

A review of the literature shows the social learning and social conflict theories both explained several group attributes such as ethnocentrism, cultural distance, competition for scarce resources, and SES, ethnicity, and gender to be associated with prejudicial attitudes and social distance.
The literature suggests that the ethnocentrism of American students is part of cultural shock and that cultural shock occurs because of enculturation and great social distance. Ethnicity is another factor of this study that shows a majority group with prejudicial attitudes within a social designation of their superiority over minority or ethnic groups.

The literature indicates that religion and ethnicity continue to play a significant role in defining an individual's identity. In the United States different denominations practice separate worship ceremonies.

The cross-cultural awareness literature mentions that American students' attitudes and social distance from various racial and ethnic groups are related to their degree of cross-cultural awareness and experiences. A study of the transmission of cultural norms indicates that the building blocks of social learning, conformity, conflict, prejudice and social distance are contained within a society's traditions or culture, generation by generation.

The conflict literature notes that social attitudes, behaviors and social distance are best understood in terms of conflict or tensions among competing groups. Such conflict need not be physically violent between American and ethnic students, and may take other forms, such as class struggle for political goals, socio-economic status and scarce resources.

Finally, the literature review points out a tentative conclusion from social distance studies. It says that the extent of
prejudicial attitudes and the degree of social distance from ethnic groups is decreasing.

Given the literature we have reviewed in this chapter, we will develop a theoretical framework in the next chapter which will serve as a guide for research.
CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the theoretical framework used to structure this research. There are two alternative perspectives used to understand and explain American students' attitudes toward international students and the degree of social distance between the groups. The first theoretical orientation is a social learning perspective while the second is a conflict perspective. From these two perspectives a set of hypotheses will be formulated.

Social learning and its basic components, as a theoretical orientation, offers the view that attitudes are formulated through the social learning process. The social conflict theoretical orientation provides another way to look at American students' social attitudes toward ethnic groups or international students. In this research we will compare the social learning and social conflict perspectives and see which of these contributes more to an explanation of student attitudes and American student's degree of social distance toward ethnic groups at S.D.S.U. Each theoretical orientation, with its related concepts and definitions will be briefly reviewed along with its dimensions, and intervening variables.

See Figure 2, Appendix A.
SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY

Jerold Heiss (1981) believed that Albert Bandura provided us with a social learning theory that captures some of the complexity of human learning and that this theory can provide a unifying structure for sociological efforts (see Rosenberg and Turner, 1981:101-104). Social learning theory recognizes a number of factors or dimensions that determine whether people will act on what they have learned (Bandura, 1977:51). According to this definition, cross-cultural awareness, culture, language, rules, roles, socialization, attitudes, behavior, and other factors are important elements in this view of learning (ibid:12-51). Moreover, the theory is distinctive in that reinforcement need not come from external sources nor be experienced directly by an actor. Humans can learn the lessons contained in the reinforcement received by others, they can provide their own rewards, and they can anticipate the future -- they can plan their actions in terms of their expectations as to what will follow their attitudes and behaviors (Heiss, 1981:103). What follows here is a discussion of a model containing these factors: cross-cultural awareness, conformity, family and friends, gender, religion and urban or rural residence. This research is specifically interested in the affect these relative variables of social learning theory have on social distance.

Cultural Norms and Conformity

Any functionalist approach to the concept of conformity is
more likely to be closer to Weber's explanation than to others. But, it is probably Talcott Parsons who developed the most clear approach to the concept and analysis of conformity and norms (Berger and Berger, 1972:343). Norms are assigned by Parsons to what he calls the "culture system". This is the repository of all symbols, ideas, values and beliefs in a particular society (ibid).

Bogardus was able to demonstrate that a cultural pattern of prejudice and social distance does exist, that it is consistent through time, and that it is shared by almost all members of the culture. Westie states that "individuals are prejudiced because they are raised in families and societies which have prejudicial attitudes as a facet of the normative system of their culture. Prejudice is acquired much as any other aspect of culture: by the learning of group norms." (Westie, 1964:583).

Family
Although it is often considered to be much more than this, for the purposes of this study, "family" is a group of individuals consisting of parents and their children. According to Seeman (1981:385) cultural norms can basically be seen as a way of focusing on "family and friends" in everyday social interactions. The general emphasis on conformity can be specified and made more workable by focusing upon the more dynamic ideas relating to normative conformity. Seeman's model, as presented in his work, The Ideas of Social Learning and Differential Association (1981) will be used for this research. The evidence of conformity is typically derived from learning via parental
attitudes, from differential contact, and from sub-group cohesion.

For example, Epstein and Komorita (1965, 1966) found that the correlations between children's ethnic attitudes and the perceived attitudes of their parents are quite high (in the 0.6 to 0.9 range), and these findings held for both black and white children in their respective families (ibid:386).

In American society the family contains the most significant others at any particular stage of an individual's life. In terms of what we have said in our review of literature about socialization, it is evident that the family, both in its overall societal form and in the particular modification of that form as it is experienced by an individual, is a fundamentally important institution. Peter L. Berger and Brigitte Berger conceptualize the family "as it were the home port from which the everyone or individual starts out on his lifelong journey through society. What happened to him at this point of departure will significantly affect the later phases of the journey." (Berger & Berger, 1972:77). Murdock (1949), in his extensive cross-cultural survey of kinship systems, arrived at the conclusion that the nuclear family is indeed universal. That is, all societies studied make an important grouping of parents-with-children, though it is true that many societies consider the larger extended family, which includes other relatives of the "blood" line, as even more important. Furthermore, in all societies the nuclear family seems to have at least four basic functions: sexual, reproductive, economic, and educational (ibid).
In the early stages of an individual's development the family is the individual's micro-world. But, later on the individual becomes aware of the family in the larger social structure. The family also provides the individual with his, or her major linkage to the macro-world. And children learn that the attitudes, education and roles expressed within the family (notably by its adults) represent various structures of the macro-world (Berger & Berger, 1972:77).

Individuals, based on their education, family, friends and cultural background, may have different perceptions about the micro- and macro-worlds (Seaman, 1981:383). It seems an individual who has an educated family and international friends may have more knowledge about others or others' cultures and may be expected to have less social-distance from others than those without these characteristics.

Cross-Cultural Awareness:
This is a rather difficult concept to define since what can be considered cross-cultural awareness can be very relative and dependent upon the actor's point of view. A definition of culture provided by Tyler in Ogburn's work is, "... that complex whole which includes awareness, knowledge, belief, art, morals, norm, law, custom, and other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." (Ogburn, 1964:3). The concept refers to a distinct set of values, norms, beliefs, and standards by which groups of people are viewed as different from each other. Culture also implies shared beliefs and values among members of society (Smith & Otero, 1977:5).
Cultural learning depends on the uniquely developed human capacity to use symbols and signs that have no necessary or natural connection to the things for which they stand. Culture is an attribute not of individuals per se, but of individuals as members of groups. Culture is transmitted in society. We learn our culture by observing, listening, talking and interacting with other people (Kottak, 1987:24-27). Awareness is one of the basic elements of culture, cultural learning and social learning theory.

Awareness is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon. It is conscious or cognizant and it is precluded when the appropriate responses are noticeable but their reinforcing consequences are not. But still, the studies of awareness are ill-suited for resolving the basic issue of whether awareness is necessary for learning or performance change (Bandura, 1977:19-22). Social learning theory and cultural awareness learning assume that individuals become aware of rights and expectations, future roles, and experiences (Heiss, 1981:103-104). Cross-cultural awareness raises consciousness about cultural differences. It is becoming aware of the diversity of ideas and practices to be found in families and societies, of how these ideas and practices compare, and of recognizing one's own cultural perspective (Smith, Otero, 1977:1).

Acquiring this perspective is one of the more difficult tasks individuals have to face. It is one thing to have knowledge of other cultures. It is another thing to accept the consequences of the human capacity for creating different cultures with the resultant pro-
profound differences in outlook and practice manifested within societies. Individuals' cultural differences are widely known at the level of myth and stereotype but they are not deeply and truly known in spite of the popular exhortation to "understand others" (Hanvery, 1975). Therefore, an individual with prior cross-cultural awareness and experience is likely to have less social distance from others than those without prior cross-cultural awareness and experience.

Gender

Identification as either male or female is important in view of social and cultural learning and socialization. Doyle (1985:9) noted that the concept gender should be used only when discussing the social, cultural, and psychological aspects that pertain to the traits, norms, stereotypes, and roles considered typical and desirable for those whom society has designated as male or female. Gender, a social concept, should be thought of as independent of a person's biological sex, (Green, 1974; Money, 1975a, 1975b; see in Doyle, 1985). For example, a male may behave in ways usually considered unmanly in his society, but that, in and of itself, does not make him less of a male (Doyle, 1985:9).

Every society differentiates among its members in different ways, expecting among other things, different patterns of attitude and behavior from them, based on their gender. Our attributes as adults are determined both by our genes and by our environment, culture, family, religion, and many other factors during socialization and development (Kottak, 1987:240). There is a strong possibility
that parents, churches and other socializing agents encourage male
and female children differently with respect to social cultural learn-
ing, attitudes, norms, and social distance. Several differences are
found in the verbal and non-verbal communication output by gender
(Doyle, 1985:197). Therefore, we can test the levels of social dis-
tance held by American male and female students toward international
students. Perhaps females are more or less prejudiced, or hold more
or less social distance.

Religion
The concept of religion in this research refers to a continuum
described by Emile Durkheim as "a unified system of beliefs and
practices relative to sacred things. This is to say, things set apart
and forbidden -- beliefs and practices which unite into one single
moral community called a church, all those who adhere to them."
(Durkheim, see Glock and Stark, 1968:163). Religion is found in all
human societies. It is a cultural universal and it has many meanings
for the people who take part in it (Kottak, 1987:261285).

Differences in religious belief and church or mosque atten-
dance, with whatever exposure to church doctrine, has an influence
on personal attitudes and may reflect different status positions
(Simpson & Yinger, 1965:83). Divergent religious influences often
produce conflict and multiple patterns of education, attitudes, learn-
ing and social distance. Religious individuals or groups may exercise
varying strategies to maintain their own identities, languages, skills,
cultures, and attitudes rather than adopt other religious beliefs.
They may isolate themselves and provide for their own group programs (Brookover & Erickson, 1975:47).

Thus, whether it is measured in terms of bonds of friendship or in terms of the extent to which persons concentrate their organizational activities within a church, communal involvement produces marked differences among religious bodies. For example, in the most conservative religious groups, such as the Southern Baptists, and their various sects, the churches tend to function as primary groups composed of persons who restrict their friendships and their organizational activities to their congregations. But the more liberal Christian denominations, such as Methodists and Episcopalian, tend to constitute a religious audience. Their members are typically not bound to their religious congregation by personal friendship (Glock & Stark, 1968:173). Furthermore, the results of a study by Lindsey (1950) indicated a positive relationship between prejudice and church attendance; Nehnevajsa (1959) found a negative relationship between the same variables; and Martin and Westie (1959) found no relationship between prejudice and church attendance (Biggar, 1962:10-13). However, Winter (1977:198-212) and Glock and Stark (1968:173) noted that religion may often provide a pool from which members select significant others and may provide different degrees of social distance. It can be predicted that the lower the church attendance the fewer barriers for establishing close positive social relationships with those of various ethnic backgrounds.
Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism is the tendency to evaluate other cultures in terms of one's own culture. Walter (1952) explains the concept of ethnocentrism as the phenomenon of prejudice on the basis of in-group and out-group theory:

Basically, ethnocentrism is loyalty to one's group, reinforced by a corollary distain or hostility toward other groups . . . . The important thing in ethnocentrism is the intensification of one's feeling of attachment to his group (Walter, 1952:27).

Fendrich (1967) says that the child learns to differentiate various groups and to attach positive or negative evaluations to these groups. Although Fendrich says that the effectiveness of differential association as normative reinforcement, the evidence indicates subgroup attitudes are correlated with the person's assessment of the norms that hold among both close friends and large networks. This is important to the modeling of ethnocentric parental attitudes and social distance and relationship between children's and parent's attitudes and between personal prejudice and perceived group norms (Fendrich, 1967; and Pettigrew, 1958; see Rosenberg & Turner, 1981:386). It seems students who test low on ethnocentrism feel a need for more contact and association with others, and feel a need for less social distance from others.

Rural or Urban Origin

The concept of rural origin in this study is similar to that described by Carlson, Lassey and Lassey (1981:8):

The U. S. Bureau of the Census technically defines rural
people as those individuals living in open country or in towns with a population of less than 2,500. Much of the data on the population in rural places is based on this technical definition.

The definition of urban used in this study is similar to that described by Palen (1987:8):

According to the definition adopted by the United States Bureau of the Census for the 1980 census, the urban population of the United States comprises all persons living in urbanized areas and all persons outside of urbanized areas who live in places of 2,500 or more.

Rural sociologists have performed social and cultural impact assessments of one variety or another for as long as the profession has existed. Studies have analyzed rural and urban community development’s impact on population and politics, institutions and individuals, families, friendships, farming practices and other socio-cultural variables at local, regional, national and international levels (Freudenburg in Dillman and Hobbs, 1982:298-300).

Many factors of an individual’s life such as norms, cross-cultural experiences, family, ethnocentrism, religiosity, and cultural awareness are distinctly different in urban than in rural areas. Ideas and information about the world and interaction with strangers may be limited in rural areas. Rural areas still have greater power to define in-groups in more narrow and limited ways (Schaefer, 1979:23-26). Hence, it can be expected that ethnocentrism and prejudicial attitudes, and social distance will be greater in individuals from rural areas than in individuals from urban areas.
Summary of Social Learning Theory

The social learning perspective assumes that social distance is a learned process as are other aspects of social life. While learning occurs in a social context, the environmental factors which impact the learning process are also important. The variables we have identified as important to this perspective are gender, religiosity, ethnocentrism, urban or rural origin, cross-cultural awareness and experience, and family background. From this perspective the level of social distance is a normal consequence of social learning and the socialization process.

See Figure 3. Social Learning Theory Model. Appendix B.

CONFLICT THEORY

In this section we will explore the structural nature of conflict and discuss why it is related to American students' attitudes toward, and degree of social distance from, international students. This section includes: 1) the concept of conflict, 2) ethnic and racial conflict, 3) socio-economic status (SES), 4) scarce resources, and 5) a summary of the conflict perspective.

Coser has defined the concept "conflict" as "a struggle over values or claims to status, power, and scarce resources in which the aims of the conflicting parties are not only to gain the desired values but also to neutralize, injure, or eliminate the rivals." Bernard claims that "conflict exists between groups when there is a fundamen-
tal incompatibility in their values, goals, interests, etc." (Tischler, 1978:123).

The history of and the research on American students' attitudes toward ethnic groups has in many universities and colleges been a history of struggling factions, ill-treatment, class struggle and conflicts, competition for grades, and equal rights to use scarce resources such as housing and jobs. For example, Hattab, an international student at S.D.S.U. said: "prejudicial attitudes and discrimination are something its victims get used to." He said many people call him names when he walks down the street and he wants to do something about it. "Sometimes you get into fights, sometimes you don't." He said American students do not have an open mind to other values, ideologies and cultures (Collegian, Feb. 19, 1986:3). The S.D.S.U. student newspaper, The Collegian, also reported that foreign students often do not have access to housing because many owners will not rent to them (ibid).

Conflict is the key explanatory variable in Marxian thought. Marx believed that the unequal allocation of scarce resources determined social relationships (Tischler, 1978:123). Marxian theory seeks mainly to answer the question, "Why do formations, such as group prejudice, and discrimination exist in the first place, and why in these places against these groups?" We could say prejudice is seen as a weapon in group relations, or prejudice may promote group cohesion and may initiate other types of interaction between groups, even between groups that previously were relatively isolated or had
great social distance from each other (Vander Zanden, 1966) Therefore, the more integrated into the group are the parties to the conflict, the less likely will conflict, prejudicial attitudes and social distance between them occur.

Ethnic and Racial Conflict

According to Feagin (1984:5) we can define an ideology which considers a group's unchangeable physical characteristics to be linked in a direct, casual way to psychological or intellectual or cultural characteristics, and which on this basis distinguishes between superior and inferior groups. Ethnic groups in this study are defined as "self-conscious collectivities of people who, on the basis of a common origin or a separate sub-culture, maintain a distinction between themselves and outsiders" (Hraba, 1979:62). In 1947 Cox was one of the first to underscore this perspective by defining a race as "any people who are distinguished, or consider themselves distinguished, in social relations with other people, by their physical characteristics such as skin color" (Feagin, 1984:6).

As the literature indicates ethnic groups are not well accepted, but there is evidence that ethnicity is less significant than race in contemporary societies (Schaefer, 1984:8-10). The ethnic community and consciousness of ethnic group members may also be learned and reinforced by their exclusions from the larger society, as prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behaviors remind them almost daily that they are different from others (ibid). This is also true of majority group prejudices within a society; the designation of their
superiority gives them the right to rule over ethnic groups. Hence, it can be expected that American students' social distance from non-American students will be greater than their social distance from other American students.

Socio-Economic Status

Another factor of conflict is the individual's familial socio-economic status (SES) which influences the interaction of the individual with others. The researcher is concerned with the first question: Are upper or lower class American students more prejudiced toward ethnic groups? McLemore (1980:117) noted social class levels as measured by level of education, income, status, job, and so on are inversely related to prejudicial attitude levels. He found that "the higher people are in the social class hierarchy, the less likely they are to accept ethnic stereotypes or to express the wish to hold people of a different ethnicity at a great social distance (ibid).

Kohn (1969 in Ritzer et al, 1979:123) for example, has found that middle-class fathers like to socialize their children to be self-determinant while working-class fathers would like to socialize their children to be obedient and conforming. Since students from middle class families are more likely than students from working-class families to pursue a college education (ibid), one might characterize the social environment of the college campus as most consistent with middle-class family students' norms and values. Hence, it seems logical that American students with higher SES background have more positive attitudes and less social distance from international students.
Scarce Resources

Another factor important to the conflict perspective is the concept of a scarce resource. A scarce resource is defined for this study as work-study jobs, campus and community jobs, or computer time. Marx felt that "the potential for social conflict was inherent in social situations that caused people to compete with each other for desirable assets" (Tischler, 1978:123). Therefore, the potential for conflict exists between student groups if they feel that their access to scarce resources is being threatened by the presence of the other group.

Sumner, in his famous book, Folkways noted that the members of an in-group have feelings of loyalty and pride toward their own group identity and have feelings of superiority. They struggle to gain superiority and, frequently, feel contempt toward members of out-groups (McLemore, 1980:121). This struggle for superiority often involves gaining control of scarce resources. It seems logical that lower and lower middle-class students should feel more competition for scarce resources from those just below them. Those closer to the top may feel very little threat from those at the bottom.

Therefore, from the above discussion of SES and from Sumner's ideas on group interest, we can assume that students with a greater perception of scarce resources such as work-study, community or campus jobs, scholarships, or computer time, will have negative attitudes and greater social distance toward international students.
Summary of Conflict Theory

Conflict theory provides a second perspective from which to see intergroup relations. From this perspective social distance may be understood as a weapon used by in-groups to keep out-groups from gaining increased access to scarce resources. It is possible that great social distance, rather than originating from social norms, may be functional for protecting in-group interests. The variables we have identified as important to this process are: ethnic or racial group conflict, socio-economic status background and scarce resources. From this perspective we can assume that the lower the SES of a student, more likely the student is to have greater social distance from students of other ethnic backgrounds (out-group). Also, students with low SES will have greater perception of scarce resources and will be more likely to have conflict with the out-group regarding use of those scarce resources.

See Figure 4, Appendix C.

THE CONFLICT AND SOCIAL LEARNING PERSPECTIVES COMPARED

In the literature review and in the previous sections of this chapter, attention has been focused upon the factors contributing to American students' attitudes toward ethnic groups. Here, we will examine some of the processes and pattern differences between the "conflict" and "social learning" perspectives.

In contrast to the conflict perspective's emphasis on
instability and student attitudes in continual struggle, the social learning perspective emphasizes stability in student attitudes. The conflict perspective assumes that social attitudes and behavior are best understood in terms of conflict or tension among students or groups competing for scarce resources. The social learning perspective assumes that social attitudes and behavior are best understood in terms of a learning process, through socialization. Finally, conflict theory assumes that conflicts need not be physically violent between American and international students and may take the form of competition for campus jobs, scholarships or other scarce resources.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Certain concepts in this theoretical model need careful clarification as to their usage in the study. These concepts are social distance, attitudes, prejudice, ethnicity and race, social learning and social conflict. It must be pointed out that while it may be possible to give dictionary-type definitions to some of the concepts and related concepts, others can, and will, only be defined operationally.

In the study of American students' attitudes toward international students, much of the research literature, however, has suggested that prejudice is one of the basic dimensions which center around one dependent variable, social distance, and two independent perspectives, social learning and conflict. The research variables related to social learning include cultural learning, cross-cultural
awareness, cultural norms or conformity, family and friends, ethnocentrism, gender, religion, and rural or urban origin. The research variables associated with the conflict perspective are scarce resources, social economic status, and ethnicity. In order to manipulate these concepts on an empirical level, the following abstract and operational definitions are offered to clarify the instrument employed to measure these variables.

The Concept of Social Distance

Many studies have sought to describe and understand the social regard with which various groups are held. Simmel, in 1908, discussed the concept of social distance as quoted in Coser:

The stranger is an element of the group itself while not being fully part of it. He is not radically committed to the unique ingredients and peculiar tendencies of the group, and therefore approaches them with the specific attitude of 'objectivity'. Moreover, being distance and near at the same time, the stranger will often be called on as a confidant. Confidences that must be withheld from more closely related persons can be given to him just because with him they are not likely to have consequences. In similar ways, the stranger may be a better judge between conflicting parties than full members of the groups since he is not tied to either of the contenders. Not being "bound by commitments which could prejudice his perception, understanding, and evaluation of the given," he is the ideal intermediary in the traffic of goods as well as in the traffic of emotions. (Coser, 1971:182).

Herbert Spencer and Georg Simmel displayed a long standing interest in understanding the structure of modern differentiated societies and in showing how people's participation in complex social systems affects their thoughts and their behavior (Turner and Beeghley, 1981:261).
In this research social distance will be used as the dependent variable. The concept of social distance was discussed in 1908 by Simmel (see in Coser, 1977) and was developed further by Park (1924). But the main research technique for the study of social distance was introduced by Bogardus (1933). Bogardus formulated a list of statements representing varying degrees of social intimacy or distance. He asked his subjects to mark those classifications to which they would be willingly admit members of a given group. The scale of statements is:

- To close kinship by marriage (1 point)
- To my club as personal chums (2 points)
- To my street as neighbors (3 points)
- To employment in my occupation (4 points)
- To citizenship in my country (5 points)
- To my country as visitors only (6 points)
- Would exclude from my country (7 points)

Bogardus sought to measure the social distance at which members of one group hold another group and its members (Vander Zanden, 1966). Bogardus' method consists of asking people to consider the above list of different kinds of social contacts and indicate which contacts they would be willing to permit with the members of various racial and ethnic groups.

People learn to desire social "closeness" to some groups and social "distance" from others. The idea "includes social nearness or social farness or any degree of distance between the extremes"
(Bogardus, 1959:7). Stated more exactly, social distance refers to "the grades and degrees of understanding and intimacy which characterize personal and social relations generally" (Park, 1924:339).

For the purposes of this study an operational but modified version of Bogardus' scale (1959:7) is used. With this "social-distance scale" with which the researcher secured the responses of 325 undergraduate American students to thirty-two ethnic, national, regional, and religious groups which can be grouped into seven groups: (1) Europeans; (2) South Americans; (3) American whites; (4) American blacks; (5) Asians; (6) Middle-Easterners; and (7) Africans.

The Concept of Ethnicity

Since the sociological analysis of ethnicity has its roots in 19th-century social evolutionism, its thematic concern has been the evolution of racial and ethnic groups in the course of societal modernization (Hraba, 1979:5). The study of ethnicity was made popular in the 20th century by the mass society theorists in sociology. This type of analysis was particularly applied to certain folk groups caught in the modernization process, that is, ethnic and racial groups.

The study of race relations on ethnic evolution is closely connected with the early Chicago School of sociology, particularly with the works of Robert Park (1924) and Louis Wirth (1924). They defined ethnic groups:

as minority groups that are designated by their ethnicity
are differentiated from the group on the basis of cultural differences such as language, attitudes toward marriage and parenting, food habits, and so forth. Ethnic groups, therefore, are groups set apart from others because of their national origin or distinctive cultural pattern. But racial groups are reserved for those minorities, and corresponding majorities, that are classified according to obvious physical differences. (Harba, 1979).

**The Concept of Attitudes**

There is some agreement as to the nature of attitudes. The literature generally agrees that personality development can be regarded as one of the main sources of attitudes and that attitudes reflect one's personality, learning and social learning (Holloran, 1967:48). Attitudes are relatively lasting organizations of beliefs which make you tend to respond to things in particular ways (Myers & Myers, 1980:78). Actually, attitudes are never seen directly. We infer their existence from what people do or say. Attitudes include positive or negative evaluations, emotional feeling, and events.

Some social theorists define an attitude simply as a class of performances that is under control of a specified social referent — much as any other learned behavior (McGinnies, 1970). Situational control rather than cognitive mediation is stressed in this behavioral concept of attitude (King & McGinnies, 1972:9).

Attitudes are human responses, and they can be examined along three dimensions: their direction, their intensity, and their salience (Myers & Myers, 1980:78).

**Direction:** The direction of an attitude refers simply to
how favorable, unfavorable or neutral one tends to be in relation to an object, person, or situation. It refers to whether one is attracted to, repulsed by, or simply indifferent to a particular course of action; whether one evaluates a thing positively or negatively. We like someone, or we do not much care.

**Intensity:** The intensity of an attitude refers to how strong it is - to how much we like to dislike someone or something.

**Salience:** The third dimension of an attitude refers to how important the attitude is to the person holding it. As mentioned earlier, we have attitudes on just about anything we know about. There are things in our lives that are much more important than others.

**The Concept of Prejudice**

Using Allport’s definition as a guide, prejudice has been regarded as antipathy felt toward any ethnic group or any member of an ethnic group. A measure of such attitudes of acceptance or rejection of ethnic groups would show then the degree of prejudicial antipathy held by the respondent (Allport, 1949). The concept of prejudicial attitudes has been labeled "social distance" by social psychologists, and various scales have been devised to measure the degree of social distance a respondent may hold toward an out-group member (Biggar, 1962:23).

We should distinguish between the concepts of attitude, prejudice and social distance. In this study the concept of attitude will be used to denote the sum total of a student's notions, ideas,
fears, threats, and convictions about specified topics. This research will look mainly at American students' beliefs (cognitive) and feelings (affective) and behavioral components. A Likert-type scale of attitude measurement (statement with which students agree and disagree) is clearly the best predictor of students' attitudes. A prejudicial attitude is defined here as an attitude unfavorable or disparaging of a whole group based upon some elements of emotion or irrationality. It is a student's judgment concerning international students and objects not based upon knowledge or experience. Social distance as the dependent variable explains why and how the American students desire social "closeness" to some ethnic groups and social "distance" from others. A Bogardus social distance-type scale of racial and ethnic groups is used to measure American students' degree of social distance from international students.

In Lindsey's study the highly prejudice students tended to favor conformity to conservative nationalistic statements (ibid:17). Therefore, a student with less prejudicial attitudes has less social distance from others than those with high prejudicial attitudes.
HYPOTHESES

Social Learning

From the perspective of social learning theory and cultural learning or cultural norm it may be predicted that:

HR₁ American students with prior cross-cultural awareness have less social distance from international students than those American students with no prior cross-cultural awareness.

HR₂ Having an educated family and international friends leads American students to have less social distance from all international students.

HR₃ There will be no difference between American male and female students' degree of social distance from international students.

HR₄ Those with low church participation will have more positive attitudes and less social distance from international students.

HR₅ Those with low ethnocentrism will have less social distance from international students.

HR₆ The more urban the background, and less social distance American students will have toward international students.

Conflict Theory

Conflict theory, on the other hand, has a very different view than social learning theory and cultural norm theories. From conflict theory view we can hypothesize that:
HR$_7$ The higher the SES background, the less the social distance from international students.

HR$_8$ The greater the American students' contact with non-American ethnic students, the less will be the social distance between them.

HR$_9$ The greater the perception of scarce resources such as work-study jobs, scholarships, computer time and community or campus jobs, the greater the social distance toward international students.

Taken together, the social learning and conflict theories and literature review lead this researcher to investigate which of the two theoretical perspectives best explains American students' degree of social distance from international students at S.D.S.U.
CHAPTER FOUR
METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This research seeks to identify American students' attitudes toward international students. The population used to test the various ideas about social distance is South Dakota State University (S.D.S.U.) American undergraduate students. The purpose of this research is to assess the presence of social distance among American students. Quantitative statistical procedures are used to check relationships between critical variables. Control variables will be used to test the nature of the relationships.

This chapter is organized as follows: unit of analysis; population and sample; research design; variables and procedures; and statistical techniques of analysis.

UNIT OF ANALYSIS

In order to test the hypotheses for this research, surveys were given to American undergraduate students at S.D.S.U.. A purposive sample (Kerlinger 1973:129) of American Freshmen, Sophomores, Juniors, Seniors, and other undergraduate students was used in this study. The basic unit of analysis is the individual.
respondent selected from this purposive sample.

**POPULATION AND SAMPLE**

The universe in this study were "American undergraduate" students at S.D.S.U. For purposes of this study in time, "American undergraduate" will be defined as all registered American students in the undergraduate program, spring semester of 1987 according to the S.D.S.U. admissions office.

Purposive sampling is characterized by the use of judgment and deliberate effort to obtain a representative sample of the population. A five percent sample of American students was used for this survey. The total number of respondents is 325 American undergraduate students who are enrolled in the undergraduate program.

**RESEARCH DESIGN**

The method employed here is the survey method. The sampling for this research provides a group of respondents whose characteristics may be taken as representative of those of the larger population; and administered questionnaires provide data in the same form from all students. This research method is selected for a number of purposes: (A) it can describe the characteristics of a large population; (B) it makes a large sample feasible; (C) a great deal of information can be obtained efficiently; (D) existing educational
facilities and personnel can be used to facilitate the collection of research data.

The questionnaire contained two basic sections. The first section involved pertinent facts related to the history and background of the individual respondents. The second portion contained questions related to various aspects of the process of social distance. For example, social distance is measured by students' willingness to have contact with members of thirty-two various ethnic and racial groups in differing social situations.

The Collection of Data

The Pretest

In late March and early April of 1987, a pretest was conducted in a course offered by the Sociology Department of S.D.S.U. entitled "The Family." This class was selected from the courses which are designed for Junior and Senior students and was therefore composed largely, if not exclusively, of Senior, Junior, and a few Sophomore students. This class was selected because the instructor and students were interested in assisting with the research. Secondly, the instructor in this class is the researcher's advisor and his class was available and open to the researcher. Also, the researcher was the instructor's teaching assistant in this course. Finally, these students were selected because they were within the universe of the investigation. The pretest was run on 30 students in this class. Average completion time of the instrument was around twenty
minutes.

The purpose of the pretest was to determine completion times and certain possible difficulties in completing the questionnaire. These difficulties might result from problems of understanding the directions, or of understanding the wording of the questions, or from student defensiveness due to the nature of the questionnaire, or from other unforseen problems in collecting data. After collection of the pretest data and receipt of the recommendations of the students, it was decided to make no changes to the questionnaire itself and only slight changes to the oral directions for giving the questionnaire. Because the questionnaire remained unchanged the pretest survey results were used as part of the research sample.

The Research Study

During May of 1987, 360 questionnaires were assigned and distributed to different departments in which a certain number of the selected courses appeared. These departments and courses are listed in Table 1.
Table 1  Distribution of the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>No. of Quest.</th>
<th>Year in College</th>
<th>Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Sociology and Juvenile Delinquency</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>So Sr</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>So Sr</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Communication and Public Speaking</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>So Jr</td>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in Nursing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Communication, American Literature and Junior Composition</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>So Jr Sr</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermodynamics, Kinematic-Dynamics and Auto Controls</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Jr Sr</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Economic Systems</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Departments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Fr = Freshmen, So = Sophomores, Jr = Juniors, Sr = Seniors.

2 Pretest.
The classes listed in the table were open to the researcher. The researcher was confined to those classes in which the course instructor granted permission for distribution of the survey. The assignment of individual students was, therefore, not random but purposive.

In choosing the courses where the questionnaire was to be distributed, an effort was made to choose courses in which an accurate response was likely. Also, an effort was made to obtain a variety of students in the sample, thus, courses from widely varied departments were chosen.

The questionnaires were designed to be completed by the respondents in about twenty minutes. After the questionnaire had been distributed to students in different classes, instructions for completion were noted on the questionnaire and were read aloud. Students who had responded to the survey in another classroom were told not to complete another survey. Respondents were reminded not to indicate their name, and were assured of the anonymity of their responses (see Appendix D).

Selecting the Questions

While a total of 360 questionnaires were distributed only 325 responses were received by the researcher. No student could be forced to participate in the experiment and complete the questionnaire.

The responses were compiled and underwent computer analysis using the statistical package SAS to determine reliability. The
final step was selecting the questions in each attitude component that had the highest relation to the main variables, and which were not subquestions. Lastly it must be pointed out that nonresponses were eliminated from the analysis. No indication could be found that nonresponse sample members were otherwise different from those responding.

**RESEARCH VARIABLES AND PROCEDURES**

The research variables together with their operational definitions will be examined in this section. The American students' attitudes and their degree of social distance from international students were measured by survey items (see Appendix D).

**Socioeconomic Status (SES):** Father's occupation was rated on a scale of occupational prestige. In classifying occupational status, a modified version of the scale used by Hodge, Siegle and Rossi (in Bassis, Gelles and Levine, 1984:285-286) was used. Those occupations given the students which did not appear on the scale were categorized by the Dictionary of Occupational Titles Code (1977) and assigned appropriate scale scores.

The student's SES is measured by the four indicators of father's education, mother's education, father's occupation, and mother's occupation as reported by the student himself (see items 13, 14, 15 and 16 in Appendix D). The mother's occupation was not included as an indicator of SES in the analysis of data since the majority of
mothers were reported as being housewives. In the event that the student's mother or father was absent from the household, the student was instructed to answer the question with regard to the male or female person(s) of his household who raised him. Father's and mother's education are taken from a fixed-format item and range from grade school or less to college or professional school graduate, on a five-point scale. Father's occupation was based upon the student's response to an open-ended question. All of the occupations in this study are collapsed into dichotomous categories for the purpose of some analysis: 1. High SES occupations: Professional, technical, and managerial occupations; and 2. Low SES occupations: Agricultural, fishery, forestry and related, service, miscellaneous, and benchwork occupations.

Age: Each student was asked to indicate his or her age in years. The number of years as of their last birthday was the figure recorded. Age in this study is broken down into two major categories: 1. Young, aged 17 to 25 years; and 2. Old, aged 26 or more years.

Rural and Urban Origin: For the purpose of this study, the towns of 5,000 or fewer residents are treated as rural, while towns of more than 5,001 residents are treated as urban.

Education: Refers to the total number of years of formal education completed by the respondent. This included vocational and technical training beyond high school as well as college and university schooling. Education is also collapsed into dichotomous
categories: 1. Low, undergraduate special, freshmen, and sophomores; and 2. High, junior, senior, and fifth year senior.

The variables of gender, education, cross-cultural awareness and experience, parental occupation, church attendance, ethnocentrism, ethnicity, scarce resources, parental residence, SES background, family and friends are to be some of the major factors of social learning and conflict variables are to be used as independent variables and social distance as the dependent variable. All of these variables are based upon students' self-reports (see items #1 to #6 and #15, #16, #17 to #23, and #24 to #29, and #35 to #38, and #39 to #43, and #44 to #47 of the questionnaire, Appendix D). These variables are also considered when the relationship between social learning attitude and conflict attitude and social distance plans are examined.

The coding of each questionnaire involved two computer cards: the independent variables were coded and recorded on card one, the indicators of the dependent variable (social distance) were recorded on card two.

Social Distance
In classifying groups, social distance was measured by a modified version of the Bogardus scale of social distance (1959:7). Bogardus' method consists of asking people to consider a list of different kinds of social contacts they would be willing to permit with the members of various racial and ethnic groups. In this study international students are considered as the minority and ethnic group.
Responses were scored as indicated on the second portion in card two as follows:

1. to close kinship by marriage
2. to my club as personal friends
3. to my street as neighbors
4. to employment in my occupation
5. to citizenship in my country
6. as visitors only to my country
7. would exclude from my country

The types of social contacts shown in the list are selected to represent fairly evenly spaced points running from a high willingness to permit social contact or a low willingness to permit social contact. These items form a scale of social distance.

Social Learning and Conflict

Pettigrew's conformity or social learning scale was composed of new items (1959) as well as adaptations form the social learning measure of Hoffman and MacCrane's (1953) study entitled "Ethnocentric Ideology and Ethnocentrism." Pettigrew found that his "C scale" predicted the relationship between social learning and the two variables of ethnocentrism and social distance, and was found to be significant at the 0.001 level (see items #12, #17, #29, #30, #39, and #41 to #47 of the questionnaire, Appendix D).

Brunswik, Levinson and Sanford (1950) analyzed the deep-seated personality functions of prejudice using the variables of conflict, ethnicity, and ethnocentrism. The conflict, ethnocentrism and
religiosity can be measured by a version of Adorno's (1950) F-scale. He applied an anonymous scale on anti-semitism or minority groups (the A-S scale), ethnocentrism (E-scale), and conflict and ethnicity (F-scale).

Responses were scored as indicated on the questionnaire using Likert type responses for the ethnocentrism, ethnicity, SES, scarce resources and conflict scales (see Appendix D).

Responses to items #26 - 30, #33 - 35 and #37 and #39 were scored as indicated on the questionnaire as yes or no for the withdrawal and anti-social contact and social tendency scales.

Responses were scored as answered for the number of years of formal education completed.

Responses for participation in church were scored for item 25: If member, how frequently do you attend church? (see Appendix D).

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES OF ANALYSIS

Statistical methods employed include the analysis of frequency distribution data. Chi square (\(x^2\)) was used to determine which questions had similar response distributions thus enabling the researcher to use only one set of such similar responses. For an example, see the dependent variable.

A goal of this study, as described in the set of hypotheses, is to test for the existence of relationships among the
variables. Analysis of variance was used to evaluate the significance of different variables, and to test the significance of the differences among independent variables. Indeed, the analysis of variance as a technique of statistical analysis has its greatest usefulness when two or more independent variables are studied simultaneously (Runyon, 1974:266). It is a statistical technique which permits us to overcome the ambiguity involved in assessing significant differences using numerous comparisons.

Level of Significance

The 0.01 level of significance was used for this study.
CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this data analysis is: 1) to assess the presence, or lack, of social distance between American and international students in the S.D.S.U. campus population, 2) to assess the strength of the social learning and social conflict perspectives in understanding and explaining the social distance of American students toward international students, and 3) to determine which other factors most influence American students' social distance from international students.

In this data analysis five basic questions are examined: 1) If social distance and prejudice are found, what forms do prejudice and social distance take? 2) To what extent does cultural awareness and experience articulate with attitudes toward international students at S.D.S.U.? 3) Does "religiosity" or church attendance have an effect on the American student's attitude and social distance from international students? 4) How do demographic and individual characteristics of age, education, cross cultural experience, family background, place of residence, gender, ethnicity, SES, and perception of scarce resources effect the American students' degree of social distance from international student? 5) Which theoretical perspective
best explains the social distance empirically measured here at S.D.S.U.? Each of the questions and the related importance of different variables is examined in turn in the following pages.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Analysis of the data in this chapter is divided into three major sections. The first objective is to describe the characteristics of the variables related to the social learning and conflict perspectives. The characteristics dealt with relate to the following:

1. Age
2. Gender
3. Education
4. Place of residence
5. Ethnicity
6. SES
   A. Father's education
   B. Father's occupation
   C. Mother's education
7. Cross-cultural experience
8. Religiosity
9. Interaction with international students
10. Ethnocentrism
    A. Limit the number of international students
    B. Reduce the quality of education
11. Scarce resources
   A. Job market
   B. Computer time
   C. Competition for grades

Tabular analysis was used to examine these characteristics. On the basis of frequency distributions that were compiled for each variable, discrete categories were, in turn, developed for compiling these data.

The second section of this chapter is devoted to the analysis of the American students' attitudes and their degree of social distance from international students. This is based upon American students' responses on a Bogardus scale for the following seven categories: South Americans, Asians, Middle-Easterners, Africans, Europeans, American Whites, and American Blacks.

The third part of this chapter is devoted to testing the hypotheses developed in previous chapters. Analysis of variance was used to determine which of the independent variables were significantly related to the dependent variable, social distance.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Once the questionnaires were completed, a total of 325 responses were filled out, returned to the researcher and subsequently used for analysis. The total number of completed responses from each student group (year in school) is presented in Table 2.
Table 2  The Number of Completed Questionnaires by Year in College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of School</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad. Spec.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Year Senior</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>325</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sophomore students and below were categorized as having a lower amount of education, while the junior students and above were categorized as having a higher amount of education. A total of 360 American students were asked to complete the questionnaire for this study, about 9.7 percent of the selected sample failed to respond. Failing to complete all responses were 35 students while 90 percent completed the instrument as requested.

A large proportion of the students who completed the questionnaire were among Freshmen, Sophomores, and Juniors. Most of these students were under the age of 26. Table 3 categorizes the ages of the students who responded.

Table 4 indicates that slightly more female than male students participated in this research. Fewer undergraduate
Table 3  Age of the American Undergraduate Students Who Responded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 - 26</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 and over</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A higher proportion (87.1 percent) of the students who responded by completing the questionnaire were from the lower age group (under 26) while only 12.9 percent of the students were 26 years old or older. The 26th year was used as a breaking point because according to the S.D.S.U. Admissions Office, most traditional undergraduates are 25 years of age or less.

Table 4  Gender of the Students in the Sample Compared to the Gender of Undergraduate Students Enrolled at S.D.S.U.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent Sample</th>
<th>Percent S.D.S.U.</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 indicates that slightly more female than male students participated in this research. From 5692 undergraduate
students who were enrolled at S.D.S.U. in the spring semester of 1987, 3137 were male students and 2555 were female students. These figures represent percentages of 45 for female and 55 for male undergraduate students at S.D.S.U. In terms of gender, the sample was very close to the population of undergraduate students at S.D.S.U.

Table 5  Place of Students’ Origin or Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 or larger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who came from an area or community with a population of less than 5,000 were classified as coming from a rural area. Those who came from an area or community with a population of 5,001 or more were classified as coming from an urban area.

Table 5 indicates that the largest portion (60.5 percent) of the students in this sample came from rural areas, while only 39.5 percent of the students came from urban areas.
Table 6   Educational Level Attained by Respondent’s Mother Compared to the 1980 South Dakota Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s Education Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent Sample</th>
<th>S.D. Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade school or less</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some schooling beyond high school</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional school after college</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the mothers in this sample are better educated than is the average woman in South Dakota. More of these mothers have achieved education beyond high school. Mothers who have less than a four year college degree were classified as having a lesser amount of education, while the mothers with a four year college degree or with some graduate or professional schooling after college graduation are classified as having a greater amount of education. Table 6 indicates that the larger portion (67.3 percent) of the students’ mothers had not graduated from college, while 32.7 percent of the students’ mothers had achieved a higher level of education.
The fathers in our sample are more likely to have achieved some level of education beyond high school than is the average man in South Dakota. Fathers with less than a four year college degree were classified as having a lesser amount of education, while the fathers with a four year college degree or with some graduate or professional schooling after college graduation are classified as having a greater amount of education. Table 7 indicates that the larger portion (68.9 percent) of the students' fathers had not graduated from college, while 31.2 percent of the students' fathers had achieved a higher level of education.

Table 6 (mothers' education) and Table 7 (fathers' education) show that there is little difference in the educational level of the students' mothers and fathers. The tables show that a small percentage (1.5 percent) of the students' mothers had a higher level
of education than the students' fathers. At the lower levels, mothers were more likely to have graduated from high school than fathers. Mothers were also more likely to have graduated from college, although more fathers than mothers attended graduate or professional school after college. South Dakota census data for 1980 shows that among males and females above the age of 25, females were more likely to have graduated from high school (a difference of 5.7 percent) while males and females were almost equally likely to have graduated from college. As in our sample, males were more likely to have attended graduate or professional school after college (a difference of 4.9 for our sample and 4.4 for the S.D. Census).

Table 8 Occupation of Respondents' Father

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low occupation</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High occupation</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In classifying occupational status, a modified version of the scale used by Hodge, Siegle and Rossi (in Basis, Gelles and Levine, 1984:285-286) was used. These occupations listed by the students which did not appear on the scale were categorized by the dictionary of occupational titles code (1977) and were assigned appropriate scale scores.
Table 8 indicates that the larger portion (69.2 percent) of the respondents' fathers had occupations in the "low" category such as agricultural jobs, miscellaneous, bench work and related occupations. On the other hand, 30.8 percent of the respondents' fathers had occupations in the "high" category such as professionals (physician, scientist, teacher, judge, minister), technical, managerial and related occupations.

Seven students gave no response to this question.

Table 9  Amount of Contact Students Reported Having With People of Different Ethnic or Racial Backgrounds than Their Own

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive contact</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Contact</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Contact</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contact</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two categories, extensive contact and some contact, were classified as high contact, while the other two categories, little contact and no contact, were classified as low contact. Table 9 indicates that the largest portion (77.1 percent) of the students had high contact with different ethnic groups. The table shows that 23.5 percent of the students have contact through their close friends, rel-
atives, co-workers, etc. who are from ethnic groups. A large portion (53.6) of the students have contact through their ethnic classmates, some acquaintances, etc. Only 22.9 percent of the students had low contact with ethnic people, that is, the students met the ethnic people in the classroom or in other situations, but did not get to know them on a first name basis.

Table 9 along with Tables 10 and 11 show that there is a relationship between the students' contact with ethnic groups and students' cross-cultural awareness experiences. In the next chapter we will examine whether or not there is a significant relationship between these variables.

Table 10  The American Students' Awareness of other Cultures Outside the U.S.A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great deal of language awareness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some knowledge of language</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great deal by traveling</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No awareness of other cultures</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 indicates that the largest portion (72.5 percent) of the students had knowledge and awareness of the specific languages associated with various cultures throughout the world. The table
shows 21.9 percent of students had no knowledge of other cultures or cross-cultural experiences.

Six students gave no response to this question.

Table 11 illustrates the students' primary sources of cross-cultural awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Awareness</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization (family, church, friends, others)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take courses in school</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to lectures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows that the mass media (t.v., radio, newspapers, and magazines) has been an important source of cross-cultural awareness for American students.

Seventy students gave no response to this question. This is 22 percent of the sample.
Table 12  If a Member, How Frequently They Attended Church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Attendance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every Sunday</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every other Sunday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four times a year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>273</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students who attended church once a month or more were classified as having high church attendance, while those who attended church less than once a month were classified as having low church attendance. Table 12 indicates that 52 students did not respond to this question because they were not a member of any church (see Appendix D, items #24 and 25). That is 16 percent of the sample. The data in this table show that there was a large portion (39.9 percent) of students who are church members and who attend church every Sunday. This table indicates that the largest portion (68.1) of students were found to have high church attendance while only 31.9 percent of the students were found to have low church attendance.

Fifty-two students had no response to this question.

The next table (13) shows the amount of interaction with international students.
Table 13  American Students' Interaction with International Student Roommates, Neighbors, or Friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Interaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 or more times/month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(once a month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every few months</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Associates</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who had contact with international students once a month or more were classified as having high contact. Students who had contact with international students less than once a month were classified as having low contact.

Table 13 indicates that the largest portion (55.1 percent) of the students had no international associates or interaction with international students. The percentage of American students having interaction with international students was higher than expected at 44.9. This finding is discussed in the following chapters.
The three support categories and the three opposition categories were collapsed into just two categories, support and opposition.

Table 14 indicates that almost half of the respondents (49.2 percent) supported while 50.8 percent of the respondents did not support the idea that international students prevent American students from having a fair chance in the job market.

Six students gave no response to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Market</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong support</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate support</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight support</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight opposition</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate opposition</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong opposition</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>319</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15  American Students' Agreement or Disagreement with the Idea that International Students Prevent Them from Having a Fair Chance for Computer Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate support</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight support</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight opposition</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate opposition</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong opposition</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>317</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three support categories and the three opposition categories were collapsed into just two categories, support and opposition.

Table 15 indicates that the largest portion (63.8 percent) of the students did not believe that the international students prevent American students from having a fair chance for computer time, while 37.2 percent of the students supported the idea that international students prevent American students from having a fair chance for computer time.

Eight students gave no response to this question.
Table 16 American Students' Attitudes Toward the Idea that International Students Unfairly Compete with Them for Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades Competition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong support</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight support</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight opposition</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate opposition</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong opposition</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three support categories and the three opposition categories were collapsed into just two categories, support and opposition.

Table 16 indicates that the largest portion (78.8 percent) of students did not support the idea that international students unfairly compete with American students for grades. Only 21.2 percent of the students supported this idea. Of all the items regarding scarce resources this is the one for which the American students showed the least support.

Thirteen students gave no response to this question.
The three support categories and the three opposition categories were collapsed into just two categories, support and opposition.

Table 17 indicates that slightly more than half (50.5 percent) of the student respondents supported the suggestion that the colleges should adopt a quota system by which they limit the number of international students. On the other hand, slightly less than half (49.5 percent) of the respondents did not support this suggestion.

Eight students gave no response to this question.
Table 18 American Students' Attitudes Toward the Idea that International Students Reduce the Quality of Education in the Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduce Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong support</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight support</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight opposition</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate opposition</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong opposition</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three support categories and the three opposition categories were collapsed into just two categories, support and opposition.

Table 18 indicates that the largest portion (76.1 percent) of the students did not support the idea that international students reduce the quality of education in the classroom, while 23.9 percent of the students did agree and support this idea.

Seven students gave no response to this question.
Table 19  Amount of Interaction of American Students by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Interaction</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 time/month</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every few months</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No associates</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>48.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who had contact with international students once a month or more often were classified as having high contact. Students who had contact with international students less than once a month were classified as having low contact.

Table 19 indicates that the largest portion (60.79 percent) of students had low contact while 39.21 percent had high contact with international students. This table shows that American female students have slightly more friends and more interaction with international students here at S.D.S.U. than do male students. A total of 2.17 percent difference exists between males and females who fell into the high contact category.
Table 20  Amount of American Students' Religiosity and Interaction with International Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Attendance</th>
<th>Frequency of Interaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not church¹</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Sunday</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every other Sunday</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Month</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four times a Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>16.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ upper number is the frequency, lower number is the percentage of total.

For Table 20, the frequencies of interaction are: 1) three or more times per month, 2) once a month, 3) every few months, 4) twice a
year, 5) no associates.

The students who attended church once a month or less were classified as having low religiosity. Table 12 indicates that 52 students (16.00 percent) were not members of any church.

The data in this table show that the largest portion of students (69.54 percent) who were church members had high religiosity. These data were dichotomously collapsed to test our hypothesized relationship between religiosity and interaction with international students.

Table 21 Amount of Opportunity Perceived by American Students for getting to Know International Students at S.D.S.U. by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Males Frequency</th>
<th>Males Percent</th>
<th>Females Frequency</th>
<th>Females Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Opportunity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some opportunity</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little opportunity</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opportunity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>48.76</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>51.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who felt they had a great deal or some opportunity for getting to know international students here at S.D.S.U. were classified as perceiving high opportunity for social interaction. Students who felt they had little or no opportunity were classified as perceiving low opportunity.

Table 21 indicates that the largest portion (68.52 percent)
of students gave the response that they had a high level of opportunity for getting to know international students here at S.D.S.U.; and more male (36.11 percent) than female students (32.4 percent) felt they had high opportunity for getting to know international students.

**DEPENDENT VARIABLE**

**Table 22** American Students' Social Distance from Several Ethnic Regional Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 upper number is the frequency, lower number is the percentage of total.

The degrees of social distance are: 1) to kinship by marriage, 2) to membership in my club, 3) to my neighborhood, 4) to my occupation,
5) as a citizen in my country, 6) as a visitor in my country, 7) exclude from my country.

The total number of students who responded to this set of questions is 325.

Since this research is interested in the degree of social distance felt by American students toward international students, the regional groups American White and American Black were excluded from the dependent variable for analysis. A chi-square ($x^2$) test of the responses for these seven regions indicated that the regions "African", "Middle East", "South American" and "Asian" yielded similar distributions. The dependent variable was, then, the mean of responses for the these four regions.

TESTING OF THE HYPOTHESES

The purpose of the third part of this chapter is to present the findings of the present investigation in relation to the results of the testing of the research hypotheses. These hypotheses deal with the American undergraduate students' degree of social distance from international students.

Table 23 summarizes the results from testing the set of hypotheses and reports the findings relative to the statistical test used to either reject or fail to reject the hypotheses.
Table 23  Results of the Analysis of Variance Test of the Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Val</th>
<th>P &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural and Urban Origin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1232652</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.7211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7077801</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.6977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2014296</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.6744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9778396</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.7370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural awareness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9005286</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.0612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3722921</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.9436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International friends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2211127</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.5379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job market</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9340559</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.4280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.652568</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.2447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quota system</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5459546</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.5597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9588744</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compete for grades</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4369656</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.0073*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.74836113</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>0.0014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.514136</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.2791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01937591</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s occupation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02500454</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.96256234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the $P < 0.01$ level of probability.

All of the above hypotheses and variables were tested at the same time, in order that the same influence could not be credited to more than one factor. Also, because of the magnitude of the numbers of the variables, we did not look at the interaction of variables or hypotheses.

It is important to note that a higher mean score means greater social distance, while a lower mean score means less social distance.

The procedure for presenting the findings will be as follows:
1. The hypothesis will be stated for testing.
2. The method for testing the hypothesis will be presented.
3. The results of the test of the hypothesis will be presented.

The Social Learning Perspective and Its Related Variables

Cross-Cultural Awareness Experiences of American Students

**Hypothesis 1**: American students with prior cross-cultural awareness have less social distance from international students than those American students with no prior cross-cultural awareness.

To test this hypothesis, the prior cross-cultural awareness that the students indicated having was compared with the responses that American students gave in their attitudes toward social distance. The results of this test were listed in Table 23, page 99.

The findings resulting from the testing hypothesis one indicated that there was no significant relationship between these variables and, thus, no support for this hypothesis. For this sample of cross-cultural awareness the degree of social distance was closely (but not significantly at 0.0612) associated with the degree of student’s cross-cultural experiences with a mean square of 4.9 and an F value of 2.50. Findings from this hypothesis show that because the association was nearly significant there may be some relationship between cross-cultural awareness and social distance.

**Hypothesis 2**: Having an educated family and international friends leads American Students to have social distance and less social distance from all international students.
Table 23, page 99 reports the findings relative to the statistical test to either reject or fail to reject this hypothesis. In this hypothesis we are actually testing three variables or hypotheses at the same time. These variables are father's education, mother's education, and international friends. There was no significant relationship between these variables, supporting the hypothesis.

The F values were 0.61 for father's education, 0.50 for mother's education and 0.62 for international friends or roommates. Their probabilities were greater than the 0.01 significance level.

The findings from testing these hypotheses lend no support to hypothesis two, educated family and international friends do not seem to be significantly related to social distance. There is no difference in the degree of social distance in relation to the variables associated with this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no difference between American male and female students' social distance from international students.

Table 23, page 99 (side heading gender) reports the findings relative to the statistical test used to either reject or fail to reject this hypothesis. The findings of the analysis of variance show a significant positive relationship between these variables, supporting this hypothesis with a mean square of 20.8.

The probability in this sample was less than the 0.01 percent level. The F value was 10.57 for this hypothesis test. Therefore, there is a difference between male and female students' attitudes and social distance from international students. Female
students have less social distance from international students.

Hypothesis 4: Those students with low religiosity or church attendance will have less social distance from international students.

Table 23, page 99 (side heading religiosity) reports the findings relative to the statistical test used to reject or fail to reject this hypothesis. The findings showed no significant relationship between these variables, so this hypothesis was not supported.

The probability of the F was 0.9436. It was not significant at the 0.01 percent level and the F value was 0.19 in this research.

Hypothesis 5: Those with low ethnocentrism will have less social distance from international students.

Table 23, page 99 (side columns quota system and quality of education) reports the findings relative to the statistical test used to either reject or fail to reject this hypothesis. The findings showed there was not a significant relationship between the variables, thus, there was no support for this hypothesis.

The probability of F was 0.5597 for quota system by which colleges should limit the number of international students, while it was 0.1895 for the idea that international students reduce the quality of education in the classroom. These probabilities indicate that the relationships of these variables to social distance was not significant. The F values were 0.79 for quota system and 1.51 for quality of education in this research.
Hypothesis 6: The more urban the background the less the social distance from international students.

Table 23, page 99 (side column rural and urban origin) reports the findings relative to the statistical test used to either reject or fail to reject this hypothesis. The findings showed no significant relationship and thus no support for this hypothesis.

The probability of the F was 0.7211 indicating that the test of a relationship between these variables was not significant at the 0.01 level. The F value was 0.57 for this research.

Hypothesis 7: The higher the SES background, the less the social distance from international students.

Table 23, page 99 (side columns father’s education, mother’s education and father’s occupation) reports the findings relative to the statistical test used to either reject or fail to reject this hypothesis. The findings showed no significant relationship between these variables and thus, no support for this hypothesis.

The probabilities of the F were 0.6544 for father’s education, 0.7370 for mother’s education and 0.9103 for father’s occupation. These probabilities were not significant at the 0.01 level. The F values were 0.61 for father’s education, 0.50 for mother’s education and 0.01 for father’s occupation in this research.

Hypothesis 8: The greater the American students’ contact with non-American ethnic students, the less will be the social distance between them.
Table 23, page 99 (side heading Ethnicity, see Appendix D, # 11 and 12) reports the findings relative to the statistical test used to either reject or fail to reject this hypothesis. The findings from the F test failed to show a significant relationship between these variables, thus failing to support this hypothesis.

The probability of F was (0.6977) for American student contact with different ethnic or racial groups. The probability was not significant at the 0.01 percent level and the F value was 0.36 in this research.

Hypothesis 9: The greater the American students' perception of scarce resources such as work study jobs, scholarships, computer time, community or campus jobs, and grades, the greater the social distance from international students.

Table 23, page 99 (side heading scarce resources, see appendix D, #42 job market, #43 computer time, #47 competition for grades) reports the findings relative to the statistical test used to either reject or fail to reject this hypothesis. The findings resulting from the testing of hypothesis 9 showed a significant relationship between these variables, supporting this hypothesis by mean square (see page 99).

The probability of the F was 0.0073 for the variable competition for grades with a mean square of 6.44. It was found to be strongly related to the dependent variable, social distance at the 0.01 level of significance with an F value of 3.28. The probability of the F test for job market was 0.4280, with an F value of 0.99. For
computer time, the probability of the F test was 0.2447 with an F value of 1.39. Neither of these variables was significant at the 0.01 percent level.

Taken together, the social learning and conflict perspectives and the literature review lead this research to pose the following: American students’ degree of social distance at S.D.S.U. is related to social-cultural and conformity factors as well as related to conflict for grades.

The results of the testing of the previous hypotheses and Table 20, page 99 report the findings relative to the statistical test used to either reject or fail to reject these hypotheses.

From all of the hypotheses covered in Table 23, the researcher was able to fail to reject five null hypotheses (1, 2, 4, 5, and 6) from the social learning perspective and fail to reject two null hypotheses (7 and 8) from the social conflict perspective. This means that there was not a significant relationship between these variables, thus failing to support these hypotheses. On the other hand, the researcher was able to find support for only one null hypothesis (3) from the social learning perspective as well as one null hypothesis (9) from the social conflict perspective. This means that there was a significant relationship between these variables and thus support for these hypotheses.
Table 24  Decisions of Whether to Reject or Fail to Reject the Hypotheses, by Decision and Hypothesis Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Failed to Reject</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Learning</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Conflict</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing and contrasting the social learning and conflict perspectives hypotheses provides the information needed to determine the contributions which each of these perspectives make to this study. The outcomes indicate that when HR₃ (Gender) was contrasted with the other hypotheses in this research, it was found to be significant. But, when HR₉ (scarce resources) was compared and contrasted with the other hypotheses in this research, it was significant.

Interpretation of results for the comparison of the two theories is of such a nature that each of the combinations (social learning and conflict) must be accounted for by the dispersion of the results. However, when one theory considers the data and observes the various treatment of another theory, a pattern appears.

In regards to social learning and conflict theories one finds that when it is compared to the other social learning variants there is no difference. When compared to all the variants of the conflict perspective a difference does occur.
CHAPTER SIX
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is: 1) to summarize the data, 2) to provide a test of the hypotheses, 3) to see what inferences can be made, and 4) to draw various conclusions on the basis of the tables in order to develop a guideline for the implications of the study in South Dakota as well as in other places.

SUMMARY AND TESTS OF THE HYPOTHESES

This section compares and contrasts the results of statistical tests of the hypotheses derived from the social learning and social conflict perspectives. Since each perspective emphasizes several different influences on interpersonal relations, a number of hypotheses may be tested. Therefore, it may be possible to gain an understanding of which of the two perspectives best explains American students' social distance from international students.

When cross-cultural awareness experiences (HR₁), educated family and international friends (HR₂), religiosity or church attendance (HR₄), ethnocentrism (HR₅), urban or rural residence (HR₆), SES (HR₇), and ethnicity (HR₈) were related to the students'
degree of social distance from international students, no significant differences were found to occur at the 0.01 significance level. Thus, these research hypotheses were not supported.

The following sections discuss in detail which research hypotheses did and did not indicate significant relationships between the dependent and independent variables when tested at the one percent significance level. In some cases several different indicators were used for a single variable. For example, for the independent variable "perception of scarce resources" the three indicators "competition in the job market", "competition for computer time" and "competition for grades in the classroom" were tested. Results of the statistical test for given variables of the hypotheses are presented and discussed.

**SCARCE RESOURCES**

When scarce resources, indicated by competition for grades, \((HR_g)\) were related to students' attitudes and social distance from international students, a significant difference was found to exist. However, when the students' attitude toward competition in the job market and competition for computer time were tested, no significant association between these indicators were found. Thus, one indicator of scarce resources was significant, while the other two indicators were not.
GENDER

Gender (HR3), a variable associated with the social learning perspective, did show a significant difference, lending support to the idea that males and females are socialized differently in American society. Female students were found to have less social distance from international students than male students as hypothesized because the mean for female students (2.10) was lower than the mean for male students (2.79).

SES

In terms of family background, no significant difference was found on social distance between those of high or low status. The fathers of sample members were slightly less educated than the mothers. Low status occupations of fathers were concentrated in the agricultural, fishery, forestry, service, miscellaneous, and benchwork occupational categories. High SES occupations included professional, technical, and managerial occupations. Mother’s occupation was not included as an indicator of SES in the analysis of data since the majority of the mothers were reported as being homemakers. Students’ SES of origin was found not to be significantly related to their degree of social distance from international students.
RELIGIOSITY OR CHURCH ATTENDENCE

No significant relationship was demonstrated from testing various levels of religiosity, thus this hypothesis was not supported. The largest portion of students demonstrated religiosity through high church attendance. The indicator of religiosity used here, church attendance by the respondent, seems the most reliable indicator of religiosity. Since the data were analyzed with all of the independent variables tested at one time against the dependent variable, it can be concluded that those with higher participation in church feel slightly more social distance toward ethnic groups. Students who had the highest church attendance had a mean of 2.63; those who had the lowest church attendance had a mean of 2.63; those who attend church every other Sunday had a mean of 2.34; those who attend church once a month had a mean of 2.51; those who attend church once a year had a mean of 2.30.

URBAN AND RURAL FAMILY RESIDENCE AND ETHNICITY

Analysis of the data failed to show a significant difference between urban and rural residence when related to students' social distance from international students, thus no support was found for this hypothesis. Table 9 indicated that the largest portion (77.1 percent) of the students had high contact with different ethnic groups through their close friends, relatives, co-workers, classmates, etc. Still, a significant relationship was not demonstrated
between these variables, and thus there is no support for this hypothesis as well.

CROSS-CULTURAL AWARENESS AND INTERNATIONAL FRIENDS

No significant relationship was found to exist between the independent variables "cross-cultural awareness" and "international friends" and the dependent variable, social distance, thus, no support was found for this hypothesis. However, cross-cultural awareness from such sources as the mass media or through socialization by family, church, school, society and friends was shown to have a nearly significant (P > F 0.0612) relationship to social distance.

ETHNOCENTRISM

No significant relationship was found to exist between the indicators of ethnocentrism and the social distance of American students toward international students, thus HR₅ was not supported. Of the indicators Adorno tested, ethnocentrism seems directly related to social distance. While Bogardus' ethnocentrism seems initially to be related to social distance, when the effect of the remaining variables was controlled, this relationship lost significance. Examination of Table 23, page 823, shows that competition for grades, job market, computer time and cross-cultural awareness variables were related to ethnocentrism, in particular the variables "quota system" and "quality of education." In fact the definition of
ethnocentrism includes aspects of these variables. Whatever dimensions Adorno's concept may include, this study found ethnocentrism was related to social distance regardless of religiosity, education, SES, and the other remaining variables on the S.D.S.U. campus.

THE SOCIAL LEARNING AND CONFLICT PERSPECTIVES

This research has provided a comparison of the social learning and conflict perspectives in an effort to explain the students' social distance from ethnic groups, applied specifically to American students and international students at S.D.S.U. The results in Table 24, page 106, have also indicated the ability of the social learning model to explain the students' degree of social distance from international students though the social and individual learning process. On the other hand, Table 24, page 106, has indicated the overall ability of the social conflict perspective to explain the students' degree of social distance from international students through struggle and group interest.

In the social learning perspective, the students will choose negative or positive attitudes by learning from others. We learn largely by visual observation of overt responses by others; cross-cultural awareness, family, friends, school, education, religiosity, gender, values, norms and other elements of the socialization process are important in this view of learning (Bandura, 1977). Moreover, the theory is distinctive in that reinforcement need not come from external sources and be experienced directly by an actor.
In contrast to social learning, the conflict perspective's vision of social order consists of individuals and groups trying to advance their own interest over others whether or not overt outbreaks take place in this struggle for learning advantage in this social process (Collins, 1985). Conflict may promote group formation, and group consciousness of a kind. It makes students aware of their shared or similar values. Groups in turn bind students together within a set of relationships; and students are interrelated through a set of roles and statuses.

Therefore, one can conclude that both social learning and conflict perspectives complement each other in this research; thus both explains to some degree why and how the American students' attitudes and social distance from ethnic or international students takes place.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This section summarizes the major findings and draws selected conclusions based on those findings.

1. A difference was found in observed of American students and their degree of social distance from international students.

2. It was found that, indeed, two factors with different degrees of importance, were significantly related to social distance. It was found that gender and perception of scarce resources by the students were the most important factors influencing the students' degree of social distance from international students.
Other factors such as the students' cross-cultural awareness, ethnocentrism, job market, computer time, quota system and quality of education were related to the dependent variable; while SES, international friends, rural or urban origin, religious- ity or church attendance, ethnicity, and education were also related to American students' attitudes and social distance, but not closely enough to reject the null hypothesis.

3. In considering the hypotheses, no significant relationship was found between variables in hypotheses (HR_1, HR_2, and HR_4 through HR_8). The results fail to support these hypotheses. Significant differences were found when the hypothesis related to gender (HR_3) and the hypothesis related to scarce resources (HR_9) were tested. The results from the test of HR_3 show that female students had more positive attitudes toward ethnic groups, when compared to the attitudes of male students and their social distance from international students.

4. Some of the findings of this study were supportive of aspects of the social learning perspective and socialization theory. In particular, gender and cross-cultural awareness through the family, church, school, society and the mass media were found to be important. Other findings were supportive of some aspects of the conflict perspective such as family social economic status background, and in particular, students' perception of scarce resources like campus and community jobs, work study jobs, computer time and competition for grades in the classroom.

5. Students indicated that the largest portion (55.1 percent) of
them did not have any contact with international students and did not have any international student friends, while a surprising 44.9 percent of the students did have interaction with international students.

6. In regard to whether social learning or conflict best explains social distance, the findings of the study indicate that generally, students' social attitudes are best understood in terms of gender and the development of cultural awareness through the socialization process. Conflict theory indicates that students' consciousness would raise through their conflict or struggle for grades. It also promotes students' group cohesion and may initiate other types of interaction between groups. Therefore, the more integrated into the group are the parties to conflict, the less likely will be conflict, prejudicial attitudes and social distance between American and international students.

7. In relation to the theories, in this research, both the social learning and conflict perspectives received some support from the data as explanations of social distance. As a consequence, it seems advisable to indicate that the combination of both theories was relevant to understanding American students' degree of social distance from international students. An attempt to synthesize these two perspectives will be presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER SEVEN

IMPLIEDATIONS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to present the implications of this study. This chapter will indicate the limitations of this study and suggest guidelines for further research related to American students' social distance from international students as well as from other ethnic groups. In this chapter we will also attempt to reformulate a model explaining social distance.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The results and conclusions of this study must be viewed and evaluated in light of several limitations.

1. The sample under study was undergraduate students who were enrolled at S.D.S.U. in the spring of 1987. The conclusions which can be made in regard to the study apply only to undergraduate students. Therefore, future studies may also include samples from graduate students to see if significant differences in American students' attitudes and social distance from international students occur.

2. Because the largest portion of the students were from small rural areas, future research may also include samples from non-rural or urban student populations to see if significant differences in attitudes and their degree of social distance from international students occur.
3. The study was limited in its sample size and selection methods. The small sample used and its purposive technique of selection impose restrictions on its generalizability. To increase the validity and generalizability of the conclusions of this research, a larger sample could have been drawn from undergraduate students. In future studies of this nature, a large sample may prove to be more rewarding.

4. Only several of the many factors found related to social distance have been dealt with in this research. This does not assume that there are not other, and perhaps equally important, variables related to this study. Church membership and denomination, marital status, type of contact (equal-status or non-equal-status), are a few suggested variables for further research.

5. Accuracy and comprehensiveness of attitude and social distance scales used here still leave much to be desired. Bogardus' scale of social distance has been challenged on several occasions, particularly on the lowest level of admittance to close kinship by marriage. Realizing its limitations, this scale was used because directions for answering are easily understood and also because less time is taken than with other social distance scales.

6. Finally, there was also the problem of measurement in this survey instrument, because of the use of ordinal and nominal levels of measurement, less sophisticated, nonparametric statistical techniques were employed, such as the Fisher test. The Fisher test is used when more than two groups are compared, as in this investigation. If the sample used in future research is large, ratio or
interval scales could be developed for the variables and thus stronger, more sophisticated statistical techniques could be employed.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The following are the researcher's findings and suggestions based upon this study.

In the statement of the problem, it was emphasized that if social distance is found, what form does social distance take, does church attendance have an affect on the American students' social distance from international students, and then, to what extent do demographic factors and experience articulate with social distance from international students at S.D.S.U.?

First of all, this exploratory study can not directly answer these questions, but it can lend support to some degree of the answers that prejudice and social distance between American students and international students at S.D.S.U. occurs in different forms. Sometimes social distance seemed to have developed through competition for scarce resources, while at other times it seemed to have developed through the socialization of the individual in the molding of their sex role identity as male or female. It was found that the female students had some cultural and social differences from American male students, the mean for male students was 2.79 while for the mean for female students was 2.10. The fact that females had more positive attitudes and less social distance from international students may be for several reasons: 1. Females generally share personal or
intimate information about themselves with others, but males usually disclose less about their personal and social feelings. 2. Male students have special difficulty in listening to others' self-disclosures and feel uncomfortable doing so. 3. Female students also are generally better at expressing or sending verbal and nonverbal (eye contact, touch, and body posture) messages as well as receiving others' verbal and nonverbal messages and communications (Doyle, 1985).

On the other hand, there is considerable experimental research evidence in Haghaghitian's work that also indicates that international students usually disclose more about their personal and social feelings with American students. They also would like to have more opportunities to get to know Americans (Haghighatian, 1983). Therefore, there are many similarities between American female students' attitudes and international students' attitudes and social distance. It seems likely that both American female and international students would like to have more opportunity to get to know others and share personal, national, cultural, international or intimate information about themselves with others and gain cross-cultural experiences.

The findings indicate that demographic variables are more closely related to students' attitudes and social distance than are some of the experimental variables previously suggested by the literature. The data suggest that American students with church participation have slightly more negative attitudes, less cross-cultural awareness, fewer international friends, etc., and social distance than the students with low or no religiosity. The means for the variable
religiosity were: students who had the highest church attendance, that is, those who attend church every Sunday had a mean of 2.43; those who had the lowest church attendance had a mean of 2.63; those who attend church every other Sunday had a mean of 2.34; those who attend church once a month had a mean of 2.51; those who attend church once a year had a mean of 2.30. This would indicate that the students with high religiosity may have negative attitudes and more social distance than those with low church attendance. This is the opposite of their religious doctrine or belief that encourages them as their daily life duties to love and help others regardless of their nationality, ethnicity, culture, languages and religion, etc.

THEORETICAL SYNTHESIS

As we mentioned in Chapter Six in relation to the theories, both social learning and social conflict perspectives received some support from the data as an explanation of social distance. Both perspectives contribute important empirical implications for this study as well as for future research.

Through a study of the initial theories and an attempt to reformulate them in light of these research findings, we can provide a synthesis of the social learning and social conflict perspectives in the form of the following model. It will be up to other researchers to test this new model.
Figure 1: A Synthesis of Two Theoretical Views and a New Model of the Research: Result as an Examination of Social Distance
Figure 1  A Synthesis of Two Theoretical Views and a New Model of the Research Result as an Explanation of Social Distance
RECOMMENDATIONS

There are a number of recommendations that can be offered for further study for community organizations and for S.D.S.U. as well as other colleges and universities.

1. Replication of the study is needed to assure that measurement validity and reliability exist.

2. Church, school and mass media education are the most important of the many ways in which data indicated American students get into and gain their information in the life of their community and society. However, this researcher thinks that American society can benefit immensely by these institutions very presence by recognizing the central way in which they can reduce the problem of prejudicial attitudes and social distance from ethnic or international students if these institutions reduce their own cultural programs. For example t.v. and schools could show more foreign movies to increase awareness. Through an evolutionary process, these institutions can facilitate cross-cultural awareness as well as modernization, and political, educational and cultural development.

3. On the one hand, church ideology has positive reinforcement for students to love and help other students regardless of their nationality, ethnicity, and religion, etc. Of the students with low church attendance, 69.54 percent had slightly less social distance from international students and had international friends. On the other hand, many students with high church attendance (30.46 percent) did not appear to have as many international friends or to have
much interaction with international students or to be conductive to participation in non-church related activities, like involvement in international activities. Therefore, the churches should encourage the students to participate in interaction with ethnic groups and reinforce the idea that American students should have international student friends.

4. The research findings indicate that 44.9 percent of American students have contact or interaction with international students as roommates, neighbors and friends (see Chapter 5, Table 13). This is a very interesting finding and it is hoped that the incidence of social distance is decreasing at S.D.S.U.

5. The researcher strongly believes, based on four years of observation on the S.D.S.U. campus, that the decrease in social distance between American and international students came about because of cultural awareness programs presented every Wednesday evening during the semester by various international student groups such as the Moslim, the Palestinian, and the Iranian student organizations, student groups composed of African, French, Latin American students as well as other international student groups. These organizations also encourage American student interaction and participation in an International Day at S.D.S.U. and in other international events and programs. These programs are sponsored by the international students' clubs at S.D.S.U. and are funded by the Student Association. Support for these programs also came from the Department of Rural Sociology. Instructors in the department encouraged students to attend the programs and even provided bonus points to students
in some courses such as Introduction to Sociology who attended the programs. The researcher believes that if other departments on campus were to follow the lead of the Department of Rural Sociology, social distance at S.D.S.U. between American students and international students could be decreased dramatically.

6. The churches, families, community and college organizations should at least once a month have international cultural awareness programs. The churches and college organizations should encourage students and their families to be members of international organizations that provide cross-cultural awareness, experiences and skill to American students in coping with international students in different situations. These organizations should also have specific programs directed at helping the students and their families in their political, cultural or other kind of international based conflicts or crises.

7. The mass-media, and in particular, local newspapers, radio, and t.v. should have one or more hours of international programs daily.

8. Education is another important factor of social learning, social conflict and socialization. According to the major constructs of social learning theory which are reinforcement, imitation, and modeling, the American students, through the school, should be rewarded or reinforced for gaining cross-cultural knowledge, friendship and positive attitudes and less social distance from other individuals or groups. Although the student should learn that there are many variations to conflict theory, most adherents subscribe to the notion that
society is made up of competing groups that continually struggle for scarce resources (Dahrendorf, 1959). For example, almost one in five students agreed with the idea that international students unfairly compete with them for grades. This indicates that American students have negative attitudes and social distance from international students. Therefore, the relationship verifies the fact that the educational job of colleges and churches, family and the mass media needs to be effective, and that these socializing institutions can make a real contribution in the education for tolerance toward other groups, probably by reducing students' ethnocentrism through institutionalized goals in their teaching education system.

This research did not show a significant relationship between family education background or religiosity (church attendance) variables, and social distance. A significant relationship was found between competition for scarce resources variable and social distance. These relationships may occur because these institutions do not have enough specific formal and informal programs directed toward increasing students' cross-cultural awareness experiences and equal opportunity for scarce resources and promoting students' positive attitudes and less social distance form ethnic groups such as international students.

9. A follow-up research study at different times during the student's college career may give some evidence on how these attitudes and social distance change.

10. Expansion of the study to include graduate students rather than just surveying undergraduates may provide further
insight.

11. Another suggestion for further research is to expand the study to include ethnic groups other than the four regional groups used in this research.

12. It might also be beneficial to conduct the study at a number of colleges and universities to discover if there is a difference between or among various institutions in rural and urban areas.
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1. Alpha Decay
2. Beta-Emission
3. Gamma Emission
4. Neutrons
5. Alpha Particles
6. Beta Particles
7. Gamma Rays
8. Electron Capture
9. Alpha Decay
10. Beta-Emission
11. Gamma Emission

Figure 2: Model of Nuclear Theories and Nuclear Binding
Figure 2 Model of Possible Theories and Social Distance
Figure 1: A Concept Diagram Model of Social Dialogue, in Which Empathy Is an Intervening Variable for Maintaining Distance
Figure 3  A Social Learning Model of Social Distance, in Which Prejudice is an Intervening Variable for Explaining Social Distance
Figure 4  A Conflict theory Model of Social Distance in Which Prejudice is an Intervening Variable for Explaining Social Distance
The following information is being collected for statistical purposes only to learn how various people view their social environment. The answers you provide will be held in the strictest confidence and will not be shared with anyone, including the S.D.S.U. administration. Please write the appropriate number that corresponds to your answer in the space provided to the left of the question.

1. Gender: 1. Male  2. Female

2. In what year of school are you?
   0. Undergrad. spec.  5. 5th year senior
   1. Freshman        6. Graduate
   3. Junior          4. Senior

3. What is your college?
   0. Ag & Bio Sci   5. General
   1. Engineering    6. Graduate
   2. Arts and Science 7. Nursing
   3. Home Economics 8. Education
   4. Pharmacy

4. What is the principle source of funding for your education?
   1. Family resources 6. Scholarship
   2. Spouse          7. Work Study
   3. Self and Family 8. Working
   5. Student loans  B. Other (Please indicate here)


6. What is your age in years?

7. How large is your home community?
   1. rural area or community less than 1,000
   2. 1,000-5,000
   3. 5,001-10,000
   4. 10,001-20,000
   5. 20,001-50,000
   6. 50,001-100,000
   7. 100,001 or larger

8. What is the largest community in which you have lived?
   1. rural area or community less than 1,000
   2. 1,000-5,000
   3. 5,001-10,000
   4. 10,001-20,000
   5. 20,001-50,000
   6. 50,001-100,000
   7. 100,001 or larger
9. My home community is in . . .
   1. East of the river in South Dakota
   2. West of the river in South Dakota
   3. Minnesota
   4. Outside the South Dakota-Minnesota area
   5. In the United States but outside the Midwest
   6. Outside the United States

10. What is your ethnic heritage background?
   1. European
   2. Asian
   3. Middle Eastern
   4. African
   5. South American
   6. Other (please specify) ____________________________

11. Think about the neighborhood (or surrounding neighbors if you lived on a
    farm or ranch) in your home community. What proportion of your
    neighbors were of the same ethnic background as you?
    1. Most of my neighbors were of my ethnic background.
    2. Most of my neighbors were of my ethnic background.
    3. Some of my neighbors were of my ethnic background.
    4. Most of my neighbors were of a different ethnic background.
    5. I don’t know.

12. Approximately how much contact would you say that you have had with
    people of a different ethnic or racial background than your own?
    1. Very much contact (e.g., close friends, relatives, co-workers,
       etc.).
    2. Some contact (e.g., some acquaintances, classmates, etc.).
    3. Very little contact (e.g., people whom you have met or been in
       class with, but didn't get to know on a first-name basis).
    4. No contact.

13. What is the highest level of schooling completed by your father (or
    step-father or guardian) by whom you were mostly raised?
    1. Grade school or less.
    2. Some high school.
    3. High school graduate.
    4. Some schooling beyond high school.
    5. College graduate.
    6. Graduate or professional school after college.
    7. Don’t know.

14. What is the highest level of schooling completed by your mother (or
    step-mother or guardian) by whom you were mostly raised?
    1. Grade school or less.
    2. Some high school.
    3. High school graduate.
    4. Some schooling beyond high school.
    5. College graduate.
    6. Graduate or professional school after college.
    7. Don’t know.

15. How would you describe the occupation of your father (or step-
    father or male guardian) by whom you were mostly raised? (Actual
    occupation) ______________________________________
    Briefly describe what your father did on this job. __________________________________________
16. How would you describe the occupation of your mother (or step mother or female guardian by whom you were mostly raised)?
   actual occupation
briefly describe what that person did on this job

17. How much are you aware of other cultures outside the U.S.A.?
   1. Great deal of language awareness
   2. Some knowledge of other cultures language
   3. Great deal of other cultures by traveling
   4. No awareness
   If no awareness skip the question number 18 to 25.

18. Which of the following is/was most important for your primary of cultural awareness or understanding?
   1. Mass-media (TV, radio, newspapers, and magazines)
   2. Socialization (family, church, friends, society)
   3. Take courses in school
   4. Go to any cross-cultural lectures or discussions
   5. Other (please specify here)

19. Before you came to S.D.S.U., how much did you know about other cultures outside the U.S.A.?
   1. Great deal of awareness
   2. Same awareness
   3. Little awareness
   4. No awareness

20. How long have you lived or traveled outside of the U.S.A.?
   1. Never
   2. Less than a week
   3. A week
   4. Less than a month
   5. More than a month
   6. A year
   7. More than a year

21. If you have lived or traveled outside of the U.S.A., in what country or countries in the following regions did you travel? (check all that apply)
   1. European
   2. Asian
   3. African
   4. Australia
   5. Middle Eastern
   6. South American and Central American
   7. North American
   8. If other, please name
   9. None

22. How many of countries in those regions have you lived or traveled?
   Please indicate those countries name in the blanks.
   1. __________
   2. __________
   3. __________
   4. __________
   5. __________
   6. __________

23. How would you rate your cross-cultural experiences with the international students at S.D.S.U.?
   1. Very positive
   2. Generally positive
   3. Some what positive
   4. Very negative
   5. Generally negative
   6. Some what negative
   7. No experiences

24. Are you a member of any church?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   If not a member of a church skip to question 28.
25. If member, how frequently do you attend church?
1. Every Sunday
2. Occasionally
3. Rarely
4. Every other Sunday
5. Once a month
6. Once a year
7. Twice a year
8. Four times a year
9. Other

26. Are you active in church activities or programs?
1. Yes
2. No

27. Does your church offer programs or services of any kind to help people from other countries or international students?
1. Yes
2. No

28. Do you participate in any of those programs?
1. Yes
2. No

29. Do you participate in the international organization such as international day, international clubs or others in your community or here in SDSU?
1. Yes
2. No

30. Are you a member of international organization?
1. Yes
2. No

31. If yes, how frequently do you attend meetings or those activities?
1. Regularly
2. Irregularly
3. Once a year
4. Never

32. Please list the initials of your closest friends.
1. _________
2. _________
3. _________
4. _________
5. _________
6. _________

Thinking of these close friends please answering the following questions:

33. Are any of those people or your friends international?
1. Yes
2. No

34. Are you an international student from some country other than U.S.A?
1. Yes
2. No

35. Do you have an international neighbors, roommates or friends?
1. Yes
2. No

36. If yes, how often do you have interaction with your international roommates, neighbors or friends?
1. Very often (3 or more times a month)
2. Occasionally (once a month)
3. Rarely (once every few months)
4. Twice a year
5. Don't have international associates

37. Do you have relatives or friends who live in other countries?
1. Yes
2. No

38. How much opportunity do you feel that American students have for getting to know international students here at SDSU?
1. Great deal of opportunity
2. Some opportunity
3. Little opportunity
4. No opportunity

39. Have you encountered any major cultural barriers between the U.S.A and international students' countries?
1. Yes
2. No
40. If yes, what is the primary barrier? 
1. Religion 
2. Student attitudes 
3. Clothing 
4. Not understanding the English language 
5. Norms and values 
6. Other (please specify here) 

41. Think about the time when you complete your studies where would you work? 
1. in the U.S.A. 
2. outside the U.S.A. 
3. Where ever a job is offered.

The following are statements with which some people agree and others disagree. Please mark each one in the left margin, by using the following scale:

1. Strong support 
2. Moderate support 
3. Slight support 
4. Slight opposition 
5. Moderate opposition 
6. Strong opposition

42. One trouble with international students is that they prevent American students from having a fair chance in our job market.

43. A trouble with international students is that they prevent American students from having a fair chance for computer time.

44. International students prevent American students from having for work-study jobs.

45. Colleges should adopt a quota system by which they limit the number of international students.

46. International students reduce the quality of education in the classroom.

47. International student unfairly compete for grades with American students.
These last questions ask how willing you would be to have contact with members of various ethnic and racial groups in differing social situations. If you would be willing to have contact in the situation indicated, place an "X" in the appropriate box to the right of the group. If you would not be willing to have contact in the situations indicated, leave the box empty. Place as many "Xs" as kinds of situations which you would be willing to accept contact with the group indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>My kinship group through marriage</th>
<th>My social groups (clubs, fraternities, etc.)</th>
<th>My neighborhood group</th>
<th>My occupational group</th>
<th>My country as citizens</th>
<th>My country as visitors only</th>
<th>I would exclude this group from my country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europeans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(U.S. white)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(U.S. black)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Easterners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipinos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would be willing to have contact with members of this group in the following situations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>My kinship group through marriage</th>
<th>My social groups—clubs, fraternities, etc.</th>
<th>My neighborhood group</th>
<th>My occupational group</th>
<th>My country as citizens</th>
<th>My country as visitors only</th>
<th>I would exclude this group from my country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians (from India)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican, Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Ricans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian, (Finns, Swedes, Norwegians)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaniards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Asians (Vietnamese, Cambodians, Laotians)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White in Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>